

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY.

APRIL, 1905.

ARTICLE I.

THE OLD LUTHERAN DOCTRINE OF FREE-WILL.*

By Professor J. W. RICHARD, D.D., LL.D.

The *Lehre und Wehre* for March and May, 1904, contains an article entitled, *The Doctrine of Free-will and Conversion in the General Synod*. The opening paragraph of said article, translated into English, reads as follows: "In the January number of the Gettysburg QUARTERLY Prof. Richard, in a violent and arrogant manner, has condemned the pamphlet of the undersigned ["F. P."]: *The Fundamental Difference in the Doctrine of Conversion and Predestination*, and has in addition presented his own views of the subject treated. We take special notice of Prof. Richard's performances, because we assume that upon the whole they represent the *state of theological knowledge in the General Synod*. We say, 'Upon the whole.' We think we know of individuals in the General Synod who have a clearer knowledge of the fundamental doc-

* In this article the word, Free-will, is used to represent the *Liberum Arbitrium* (Mind and Will united) of the older theology. No doubt much confusion arose from this unfortunate combination. Mind as intellect is the soul's faculty for knowing. The Will is the soul's faculty for choices. But the Will cannot choose until the intellect has known or cognized an object. But whenever the soul acts in knowing it at the same time acts in feeling and in willing, for it is the one identical soul that acts, though now the soul may act predominantly as knowing, now predominantly as feeling, now predominantly as willing. These facts are of fundamental importance and should be kept in view throughout this discussion.

trines of the Christian religion than Prof. Richard has shown in his QUARTERLY article. But in general the theological, or rather the untheological, standpoint of Prof. Richard's article is characteristic of the General Synod. A proof of this is the review of Richard's article in *The Lutheran Observer*, the chief organ of the General Synod. This paper can scarcely say enough in praise of Richard's performances, and regards them as a splendid refutation of the teaching of the Synodical Conference."

Our answer to this paragraph from the pen of Prof. Pieper is that so often made by the schoolmen to similar "performances": *Transcat.*

To our surprise Professor Pieper has made no effort to refute our criticism of his misinterpretation of Melancthon's doctrine of Free-will; nor has he undertaken to show that our parallel between the teaching of Melancthon and that of Chemnitz on Free-will, is untrue; nor has he tried to overthrow our conclusion that the Missouri teaching on the subject of Predestination is essentially Calvinistic. It is very significant that Professor Pieper should pass over the more important parts of our article, and entertain himself with filing objections to certain purely incidental parts, and especially with making a long harangue against "modern theology"—not the theology of Ritschl and Harnack, who "stand outside the Christian Church," but against "the Richtung which still holds fast to the chief doctrines of Christianity, the doctrines of the Person and Work of Christ, of sin and grace, but wish *so to fashion and shape* them, as to make them acceptable to human reason, namely, to the reason of people of culture,"—meaning, we suppose, the Richtung represented by such Lutheran theologians as Thomasius, Frank, Luthardt, Dieckhoff, Cremer, for whose theology we confess, as Professor Pieper charges, "admiration and endorsement." We have admired those distinguished teachers as men, and, having studied their works, we very heartily endorse in general their presentation of the Lutheran teaching on the "chief doctrines" of our most holy faith. But we do not feel called upon to defend these teachers of "modern theology." They need no defense. Their praise is

in all the churches, except in those that wear the collar of Missouri; and their works, we venture to predict, will stand as milestones on the highway of Lutheran history when the "performances" of their detractors shall have been relegated to the forlorn limbus of forgotten lore. In a word, we have but small interest in Professor Pieper's article as a whole, inasmuch as it cannot be considered an answer to the chief points embraced in our discussion; only the second paragraph specially interests us. It reads as follows: "Prof. Richard aims chiefly to prove two things: First, that Melanchthon's Synergism was the *genuine Lutheran doctrine* of the sixteenth century, and that by a transformation—'within less than twelve months'—it was shoved aside by the authors of the Form of Concord. Secondly, Prof. Richard wants also to show that Melanchthon's doctrine is also the doctrine of the Scriptures."

We object decidedly to the manner in which "F. P." has summarized our article, entitled, *The Lutheran Predestination Controversy*. But we pass this by also, and, accepting the challenge implied in "F. P.'s" article, we proceed to set forth *The Old Lutheran Doctrine of Free-will*, or rather, the doctrine of Free-will that prevailed in the Lutheran Church from A. D. 1530 to the death of Melanchthon in A. D. 1560. Nor can a discussion of this theme be rightly regarded as untimely; since for more than a quarter of a century a divisive controversy has raged between sections of the American Lutheran Church on the subject of Predestination and Free-will. This controversy has excited great interest in Germany; and that for the reason that it involves the pivotal doctrine of justification by faith alone, and is to decide ultimately whether the Lutheran Church is to remain Lutheran at its center, or is to become essentially and fundamentally Calvinistic by having its center transferred to the doctrine of Absolute Predestination with its corollary of irresistible grace.

Hence it is presumed that every Lutheran theologian and clergyman in America will welcome a discussion of any principle that underlies or is essentially connected with said controversy, especially when we announce that our treatment is to be *historico-thetical*, rather than controversial as against Pro-

of Lutheran quarterly

fessor Pieper, inasmuch as we could have no expectation of convincing him that the position of the Synodical Conference has no proper foundation either in the history of the Lutheran Church, or in the Word of God. And we are moved to make the following presentation chiefly by our profound conviction that the estranged and warring parties of Lutherans in this country can never become reconciled to each other, and can never become generally united in one body, until all shall have made a more thorough study of the *origines* of Lutheran history and doctrine, and also a deeper imbibition of the spirit of charity and of mutual respect and confidence, that animated the lives and regulated the conduct of Luther and Melancthon toward each other. That is, before the different Lutheran bodies in this country can come to a better understanding with each other, they all must come to a better understanding as to what is *primo-fundamental*, *central*, and *determinative* in Lutheranism, and as to what is relatively *secondary* and *peripheral* in Lutheranism; and all must learn to exercise more of that love that "beareth all things; believeth all things; hopeth all things; endureth all things." And it behooves all to recognize the fact that Lutheranism is not a mathematical quantity, nor a fixed point, but a system of doctrines having some freedom of motion within certain metes and bounds; and all must sooner or later come to realize that it is as psychologically impossible to make all Lutherans think alike and hold alike on all doctrines embraced in the Lutheran system, as it is physically impossible to make all clocks tick alike and strike alike in marking the passing hours of the day.

It is in part with the hope of making at least a small contribution to the inculcation of the principles stated above, that we now advance to the discussion of the subject placed at the head of this article, and we begin with the year 1530; for prior to that time there was no Lutheran Church, but only *Lutherans*, who were united in opposition to the teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, rather than in a distinct positive programme of their own. Indeed, prior to the year 1530 there was no general confession of faith among Lutherans, no single bond that held them together and constituted them a Church. Hence

the year 1530 and the Confession delivered at Augsburg in that year must be regarded as normative for Lutheranism and for the Lutheran Church. The Apology of 1531, which proceeded from the author of the Confession, and was approved by Luther and by contemporaneous Lutherans generally, must be regarded as the most important exposition and defense of the Confession. The Schmalkald Articles have value as exhibiting the testimony of many Lutheran teachers against the characteristic teaching of the Papacy and of papal scholasticism, though their violently polemical character imparts to them features of one-sidedness, and correspondingly diminishes their value as an abiding testimony in the Lutheran Church. The Form of Concord did not arise out of the warm, pulsing, generative heart of the original Lutheranism nor did it proceed from the pens of those who stood face to face with the great crisis out of which the Lutheran Church was born. It is manifestly the child of a reviving scholasticism, and was the production of men who had begun to construct systems, and who thought that they could reconcile or remove existing differences of view by exclusions, concessions and compromises. Hence, and also by reason of the prolixity of its presentations, it in many places lacks in distinctness and definiteness of statement, while its breadth is no broader than the scholasticizing philosophy that underlies it and determines its form could permit it to be; for every system of theology, every *Dogmatic*—and the Form of Concord is to no inconsiderable extent a system of theology, a *Dogmatic*—takes the size and shape and form of the mental scheme, logical or philosophical, that is employed in handling the materials, even though the materials be taken from the Word of God. Hence, the Form of Concord, by reason of the date of its origin, and because of the rank of its authors as epigoni, and because of the mental scheme that determined its construction, does not lie within the normating bounds of Lutheranism, and cannot be regarded as strictly normating for the Lutheran Church, at least not in the sense that a man's Lutheranism must be tried, tested and determined by its deliverances, though it may be highly prized as a theological treatise, and as exhibiting the sense in which

certain theologians of the second generation of the Lutheran Church were brought, under great pressure from within and from without, to profess to understand the earlier Lutheran confessions, though it is certain and demonstrable that in previous years, and in the Torgau Book and its antecedents, they had expressed themselves on some subjects very differently from what they did finally in the Form of Concord;* particularly is this the case in regard to the doctrine of Free-will, as is clearly shown by reference to the private and official writings of at least four out of the six authors of the Form of Concord—a fact we stand ready to demonstrate when called on so to do, but meanwhile we ask the reader's attention to a study of the doctrine of Free-will that prevailed in the Lutheran Church from A. D. 1530 to A. D. 1560.

I. IN GENERAL.

It has never been maintained by any Lutheran theologian that Luther's doctrine of Determinism and his doctrine of the "hidden God," as the same are exhibited in the *Assertion of All the Articles* and in the *De Servo Arbitrio* found place in any Lutheran Confession of faith. Neither does his description of Free-will (*Liberum Arbitrium*) as "a downright lie," a "name without reality," and of man in spiritual matters, as being "like a pillar of salt; like Lot's wife; yea, like a block and a stone; like a dead image that does not have the use of eyes, mouth, senses and heart,"† find place in any of the older confessions of the Lutheran Church, not even in the Catechisms, nor in the Schmalkald Articles, written by Luther's own hand. And no person by reading and studying those confessions in their own *verbis ipsissimis*, would or could suppose that the persons who composed and set forth those confessions had ever taught, or meant that those confessions should teach, any such doctrine as is both implied and expressed by the words and sentences quoted above. This statement is so much a matter of fact, that no argument is needed to prove it. The reader can verify it by consulting the documents in question,

* See THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, January 1904, pp. 58 *et seqq.*

† *Form of Concord*, Art. II.

the while abstaining from reading into them what is not in them. Moreover, it is well known that during the year 1524 Melancthon began to doubt the tenability of his own and Luther's deterministic views; and it is also known that his view in regard to Free-will underwent a radical change before he wrote the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, and that subsequently he positively and energetically rejected the words, "stone," "statue," and the like, as applied to man or to his will in relation to conversion. We know also that he purposely kept the doctrine of predestination out of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, because of the perplexing controversies to which it leads, and that he then already professed to teach habitually that Predestination *follows* faith.* And while it is true on the one hand that Luther did not formally revoke the predestinarian teaching found in the *De Servo Arbitrio*, it is unquestionably true on the other hand that he let it drop completely into the background, the longer the more, until finally, toward the close of his life, "in his explanation of the 26th chapter of Genesis he materially corrected and modified his earlier statement."†

The knowledge of these facts is of fundamental importance as we enter on the study of the Lutheran doctrine of Free-will, as that doctrine received form and expression in the oldest Lutheran confessions, and as it persisted so long in the Lutheran official and private teaching.

II. THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

In the eighteenth article of this confession we read as follows: "Of Free-will it is taught that in some sense man has Free-will outwardly to live honorably, and to choose among those things which reason comprehends; but without the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit man is not

*C. R. II, p. 547.

†Frank in *Die Theologie der Concordienformel*, I, p. 130. Kahnis says: "It can be proved that with him (Luther) this doctrine more and more fell into the background." *Christentum und Lutherthum*, p. 163. Philippi declares that Luther "recalled his earlier utterances on the subject," *Glaubenslehre*, 2 Ed. 4. 1. p. 37. See THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, April, 1903, pp. 193 *et seqq.*

able to become pleasing to God, to fear God heartily, or to believe in him, or to cast the inborn evil concupiscence out of his heart; but such things are effected through the Holy Spirit, who is given through the Word of God." Here we have the fundamental teaching of the Lutheran Church concerning Free-will (*Liberum Arbitrium*, mind and will conjoined,) in its relation to external morality, and also in its relation to God; and this is the only confessional teaching on the subject that is catholic in the Lutheran Church and that is universally accepted by the Lutheran Church.

Now let us analyze this first, this only universally accepted, confessional statement of the Lutheran doctrine of Free-will.

First. In the first sentence it vindicates the essential freedom of the human will, in that it declares that man, that is the natural man, has the power of choice. The human will can of its own power, and by its own determination, accept or reject a thing made known by the human reason. This power, more than any other, constitutes man a personality. In a sublime sense the Will is the personality, not that it is the whole of the personality, but it is the culmination of the personality, and is the most important power of the human soul. It is the power to which all other powers of man point, as it is the power which directs and employs all the other human powers. It is the power by which man becomes an ethical factor in the world, and becomes responsible for his use of all his other powers. It is the power by which he determines to hear and to meditate on the Word of God, which is the *conditio sine qua non* of his becoming a Christian. Melancthon, in his *De Anima*, says: "The Will is the supreme appetent power, and acts freely when an object has been made known by the understanding. Its actions are to accept and to reject (*velle ac nolle*). Between these is the suspension of action. It wills what is, or what seems to be, good. It avoids what is, or what seems to be, evil."* He defines freedom as "the power of the will which is able to act, or not to act, or to act thus or otherwise." He unqualifiedly rejects the "Stoic necessity," and insists on the ability of man to regulate his ex-

* *C. R.* .3: 153.

ternal actions. But it is not said, nor is it implied, either in the Confession or in the *De Anima*, nor in any writing of Melanchthon's after 1525, that man, or the human Will, is, or is like, a block, a stone, a statue, or a pillar of salt; and much less is it said or implied in the writings in question that man is worse than a block, a stone, a statue and the like, and no person can read these words *into* the Confession or *into* any writing of Melanchthon's after 1525, without committing an act of sheerest interpolation; nor should the ideas conveyed by those words be required of any one as a test of honest subscription to the Augsburg Confession, since such ideas are not generic nor catholic in the Lutheran confessional system, and only that which is generic and catholic in Lutheranism can be required as a test of Lutheranism. It is therefore Lutheran to affirm that the human Will possesses the inherent power of choice in things made known by the understanding. And it is to be noted also that Melanchthon in his *De Anima* is in perfect accord with the Confession on this subject.

Secondly. When it is said that without the grace, assistance and operation of the Holy Spirit, man cannot become acceptable to God, etc., the plain implication is that by such grace, assistance and operation, he *can do* those things that are required of him in his relations to God. The underlying idea is that grace imparts strength and power to the Will, and this it does both by illumining the understanding and by impact as of personality upon personality. Or, as Melanchthon says in the *De Anima*: "The Holy Spirit does not take away the freedom of the Will, but corrects it and turns it to God, according to the maxim: *But he who draws, draws him who is willing.* Joseph's will had power to shake off the Holy Spirit; but when assisted it recovers itself and yields to the Holy Spirit." *

The grace and assistance of the Holy Spirit are *precedent* and *operating*, as Augustine says; that is, they anticipate the Will and are active, stimulating and energizing upon the Will. They do not destroy the natural faculties of the human soul, the inherent power to know the truth and the inherent and es-

*C. R. 13: 162.

sential power to act in view of the truth, but they quicken and strengthen these faculties and arouse them to competency for actions which by reason of sin they are able neither to begin, nor to accomplish by the powers of nature (*peragere*). Such at least must be regarded as the plain common-sense meaning of the passage. Certain it is that the *absolute passivity* of the Will under the operation of the Holy Spirit is neither expressed nor implied in the eighteenth article of the Augsburg Confession; but the *activity* of the Will under such divine operation is clearly implied, otherwise there would be no meaning in the word "assistance," and conversion would be *per modum coactionis*. And this conclusion in regard to the activity of the Will under the conceded divine operation is strengthened when it is said: "But this takes place through, that is, by the agency of the Holy Spirit, who is given through, that is, by means of the Word of God," or as the Latin has it: *Haec fit in cordibus, quum per verbum Spiritus Sanctus concipitur*—*taken, or laid hold of, or taken to one's self*, as the word *concupitur* is defined in the dictionaries—which can be done only by an action of the Will. When the Holy Spirit takes the things of Christ and shows them to men, and by his gracious activity stimulates the Will, a struggle is inevitable, and the Will must decide; it must obey the truth, or it must reject it. Otherwise, conversion is left without ethical content, and the abiding in sin is without responsibility. The Will under the operation of the Holy Spirit cannot remain in equilibrium, and the Holy Spirit cannot decide for it. Its own conduct (*Verhalten*) now determines its destiny. No other meaning can be extracted from the eighteenth article of the Augsburg Confession without first reading into it words, or thoughts, or conceptions, that are foreign to it.

Moreover, this interpretation, or one of identical import, was placed on the Article at Augsburg in 1530. The following facts are matters of official record: (a) In the first *Confutation* (Ficker, p. 60) the Confutators say of this article: *Sana et catholica est haec assertio principum*, and warn the princes against the Determinism expressed in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and in the first edition of Melancthon's *Loci*.

(b) In the Confutation of August 3rd the Confutators say: *Quae confessio acceptatur et approbatur.* In both cases they state how they understand the article *De libero arbitrio*, that is, essentially as Melanchthon had explained in his private writings of 1527-30. (c) August 18th, the Lutheran seven (Duke John Frederick, the Margrave of Brandenburg, Drs Brück and Heller, Melanchthon, Brentz and Schnepff) of the famous committee of reconciliation, after a two days' conference with the Catholics, reported: "In the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth and nineteenth articles there is no difference." And Eck from the Catholic side reported: "Article eighteen agrees in regard to Free-will." *

It is simply preposterous to conclude (after having read the two confutations and after having noted the fact that Melanchthon in the first draft of the Apology makes no reference to Article XVIII) that such perfect agreement on said Article could have been effected on the basis of the *absolute passivity* of the Will, or on the theory of *truncus* and *lapis*; and if the Lutheran seven, here acting in an official capacity falsely interpreted the Article, or acquiesced in a false and mistaken interpretation by the Catholics, and thus betrayed their friends and hoodwinked and deceived their opponents, then it is impossible to shield their names and their memory from the imputation of falsehood, treason and hypocrisy. Moreover, the Confession (Art. 21) boasts that "there is nothing in it which is discrepant with the Scriptures, or with the Catholic Church, or with the Roman Church, in so far as it is known from writers." But every tyro in the History of Doctrines knows that the *lapis-truncus-mere passive-subjectum patiens-subjectum convertendum* theory of Free-will and of man does not have the consensus either of the Catholic Church, or of the Roman Church, as it is known from writers.

Then were the Confessors at Augsburg insincere? Did they equivocate? Did they hide their convictions? Did they mutilate and obscure their own faith and that of their churches? Or did they faithfully witness and heroically defend that faith? Which horn of the dilemma will Professor Pieper take?

*See *The Lutheran Quarterly* for July, 1900, pp. 374-384.

LONGE FUGE: FENUM HABET IN CORNU.

And now when we bring all these facts together we get a total impression that is simply irresistible. Hence we may confidently say of the Article: (a) The idea of the *absolute passivity* of the Will in conversion is excluded. (b) The idea of the activity of the Will in conversion is not excluded. (c) The idea of the activity of the Will in conversion is clearly implied by the German word *Hilfe*, and by the Latin word, *concupitur*. But it must not be concluded that Melanchthon intended to ascribe to Free-will the *beginning* of conversion, or to hint at any justifying merit on account of the activity of Free-will in conversion. These things were never taught by Melanchthon, as we shall hereafter demonstrate.

Nor was the doctrine of Free-will as set forth in the Confession new among Lutherans. Already it had been taught by Melanchthon for three years before he wrote the Augsburg Confession. In an *Excursus** to his *Scholia on Colossians*, published in 1527, he asserts the natural or essential freedom of the Will in the most unqualified terms. He says: "The Will has freedom in choosing those things that belong to nature, as to choose this or that kind of food, to put on this or that kind of clothes, to go hither or thither, to restrain the hand from murder, to abstain from another man's wife. * * * Paul calls these the deeds of the law, which men do without the Holy Spirit, when they obey the law." But Melanchthon also says: "It must be maintained that the nature of man by its natural powers is not able to produce the true fear of God and true confidence toward God, and the other spiritual affections and emotions. * * * We have need of the Holy Spirit to renew and to purify us. * * * What need is there of the Holy Spirit if human nature by its own powers is able to fear God, to trust in God, to lay aside concupiscence, to love the cross? * * * To man God imparts reason and choice. That choice he does not take away, but he imparts life and motion, while we *choose* and *act* (italics ours,) as it is written: '*In him we are, live, and are influenced.*'" The fact is, Melanchthon simply

*Quoted in Galle's *Characteristik Melanchthons*, pp. 277-8. The *Scholia on Colossians* is not reprinted in the *C. R.*

condensed in the Confession what he had taught in the *Excursus* to the *Scholia*. The sentiment is the same; the species of doctrine is identical. To prove this and to make it patent even to the eye, we place the characteristic passages of the *Excursus* and Article XVIII in parallel columns:

Excursus.

De Liberi Arbitrii facultate. Habet libertatem voluntas humana in deligendis his, quae $\phi\upsilon\chi\iota\kappa\alpha'$ sunt, ut hoc aut illud cibi genus eligere, hoc aut illo genere vestitus uti, huc aut illuc ire, habet et vim carnalis et civilis justitiae efficiendae.

Quaeritur an sine Spiritu Sancto possumus Deum timere ac credere Deo et crucem amare, etc. Item ut discimus, Spiritu Sancto nobis opus esse, qui renovit nos et purificet.

Quid enim opus est Spiritu Sancto, si humana voluntas suis viribus potest timere Deum, fidere Deo, deponere concupiscentiam, amare crucem. Denique quae est ista arrogantia, non petere auxilium Spiritus Sancti; cum promiserit eum Christus, sed magis jubere, ut a viribus nostris auxilium petamus? Habes igitur, quae non possit efficere ratio per se.

Cum humanae mentes audiunt verbum Dei et non repudiant, Spiritus Sanctus simul movet eas, ut perterrefiant et rursus erigantur.

Article.

De libero arbitrio docent, quod humana voluntas aliquam libertatem ad efficiendam civilem justitiam et deligendas res rationi subiectas.

German: Von freien Willen wird gelehret, dass der Mensch etlichermassen einen freien Willen hat äusserlich ehrbar zu leben und zu wählen unter denen Dingen, so die Vernunft begreift; aber ohne Gnad, Hilfe und Wirkung des heiligen Geistes vermag der Mensch nicht Gott gefällig werden, Gott herzlich zu fürchten, oder zuglauben, oder die angeborne böse Lust aus dem Herzen zu werfen; sondern solchs geschicht durch den heiligen Geist, welcher durch Gottes Wort gegeben wird.

[See English Translation of German text p. 159.]

Sed non habet vim sine Spiritu Sancto efficiendae justitiae Dei seu justitiae spiritualis, quia animalis homo non percipit ea, quae sunt Spiritus Dei; sed haec fit in cordibus quum per verbum Spiritus Sanctus concipitur.

This parallel shows that the thought of the *Excursus* and the thought of the Article are identical. The German Article, *mutatis mutandis*, might pass almost as a condensed translation of the essential points of the *Excursus*. In the Latin we have the pivotal words and sentences of the *Excursus* transferred almost unchanged to the Article. Hence we may lay it down as demonstrated that the *Excursus* is the antecedent and pre-

conception of the Article, just as several of the Schwabach Articles are the antecedents and preconceptions of several of the first seventeen articles of the Confession. Melancthon had the *Excursus* before him, either in print or in his memory, as a familiar and matured conclusion *de libero arbitrio*. In the *Excursus* the doctrine *de libero arbitrio* is presented in elaborated form, as is befitting the nature of an *excursus*. In the Confession, the doctrine is presented in the most condensed form, as is befitting the nature and purpose of a confession. In both instances the author affirms the essential freedom of the Will, its power to *choose*. In both instances he affirms the need of the Holy Spirit; in both he speaks of the "help" of the Holy Spirit; in both he employs the instrumentality of the Divine Word; in both he declares the natural impotence of the Will for effecting spiritual righteousness. "The human will does not have freedom to perform Christian or spiritual righteousness. There is need of the Holy Spirit." *Excursus*. "It (the human will) does not have the power without the Holy Spirit to perform the righteousness of God, or spiritual righteousness." *Confession*. Identity in the main things could hardly be more identical. The teaching of Melancthon *de libero arbitrio* has (1527-1530) undergone a radical change. It is now as different from the teaching on the same subject found in Luther's *De Servo Arbitrio* and in the first edition of the *Loci* as the light of the sun is different from the light of the moon. It is fundamentally a different kind of doctrine. Melancthon no longer affirms that "all things occur necessarily according to the divine predestination, and that there is no freedom of our will." On the contrary he now affirms that "God has given man *reason and choice*," and that "we *choose*, we *act*." Man is not in any sense compared to a block, or to a stone, or to a dead image. "God moves trees in one way, cattle in another way, men in another way, according to the nature of each." "God imparts life and motion, while we *choose* and *act*." All beginning is from God. "The grace, help and operation of the Holy Spirit" are absolutely necessary; but they not only do not *exclude*, they *include* the idea of consequent *activity* on our part. The Holy Spirit acts that we *may be enabled* to act. He

supplies the conditions and imparts to us the power of acting aright. And now we, as essentially free personalities, cannot help acting, choosing, determining. The Holy Spirit, by his operation, has changed the center of gravity in our souls. He has put a new perception into our understanding, a new thought into our mind by means of the truth. A psychical change has been wrought. Henceforth and forever we will carry a new impression. And now by that law of mind, according to which when one faculty of the mind acts, all the faculties act, there results some form of volitional action. The will either advances toward, or it recoils from, the object of perception, of thought. That it should do so is the necessity of consequence. The divine *auxilium*, *Hilfe*, has made it psychically and morally necessary for us to act, otherwise there is no meaning in these words. We are helped *to act*; the acting we cannot avoid; but by the power of self-determination, which is the climax of our personality, we can assent to the truth that has been made known to us and has been urged upon us, or we can resist it. By assenting we gain ampler knowledge of the truth and larger freedom in obeying the truth.

Thus conversion has a God-ward side and a man-ward side. It is an effect wrought in man by the Holy Spirit, but in the man who *apprehends* the truth when it is divinely made known, and who by an act of his own will, divinely assisted, assents to the truth, and does not resist it. Hence repentance is called *μετάνοια*, a change of mind; and faith, *πίστις* (from *πείθω*), a persuasion in regard to something—both are gifts of God, but both are acts of man. The command to repent, and the command to believe, which come to us by divine grace and attended by the divine energy, would be but mendacious imperatives, were there no power in us, under the given conditions, to make response, that is, to determine ourselves for or against the commands. Moreover, having posited the essential freedom of the Will, as Melancthon did, as the power *to choose* and *to act*, volitional action, since knowing, feeling and willing always coexist, exists whenever the soul comes to know an object which is at the same time an object for choice and decision. By the Word of God the soul comes to know the

truth, and to perceive a duty in the divine commands, *Repent, Believe*. Therefore, etc. To conclude otherwise is to conclude against the teaching of Scripture, against the facts of experience, against a fundamental law of the mind; is to conclude that we are automata in the hands of God, "worthless links in an adamantine series of causes and effects"; is to glorify the sovereign will of God by annihilating the self-determining will of man; is to find the ultimate ground of salvation in the particularistic divine decree and not in God's universal will of salvation; is to push the Lutheran *fides specialis*, which requires not only knowing, but also willing, from its central position, and to put the Calvinistic *gratia irresistibilis* in its place; is to print the love of God in the margin, and to chuck man, the image of God and the subject of salvation, into a pigeon-hole; is to change the center of gravity of the Lutheran system, and to build the Order of Salvation on an abstract proposition, and not on "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life."

III. OTHER WRITINGS.

1. In the *Saxon Visitation Articles*, formally endorsed by Luther and Bugenhagen, we have an exhibition essentially of the same doctrine of Free-will. It is affirmed that the Will is free to do the works of the law, but that "spiritual righteousness must be *accepted* from above."* The words, stock, stone, statue, are not used, and the understanding and the will are not spoken of as "the subject to be converted." And yet it was on the basis of these articles that the Saxon churches accepted the Wittenberg teaching and were reformed according to the Lutheran conception of doctrine and practice.

We now quote from Melancthon's *Annotations on the Epistle to the Romans*, 1529: "When we have conceived faith, now truly we know that God cares for us, that we are protected by God, and we venture to call upon God and to seek assistance. Nor is faith obtained without a *struggle*. In the whole course of life, we must contend with our unbelief and *must arouse the*

* C. R. 26 : 27, 78, 79. Italics ours.

sluggish conscience by the Word and by faith."* And on p. 478 *ibidem*: "The prophet speaks of another Word, which preaches the remission of sins, and freely offers righteousness to those who believe. But he teaches that faith is attained in this wise, if we hear the Word, even though it be preached by the human voice. Therefore the efficient cause of faith is the Word, by which God *persuades* and *moves* hearts to believe. Without the Word the Holy Spirit is not given." It is evident that in these passages Melancthon views conversion as an ethical process, in which God uses ethical means—"persuades and moves"—and in which man uses his Free-will. Attention may be called specially to the declarations that "faith is not attained without a *struggle*," and that as long as we live we must *resist* our own unbelief. And that the salvation of the individual does not depend on particularistic predestination had been already declared in *The Scholia on Colossians*: "When human minds hear the Word of God, and *do not reject* it, the Holy Spirit at the same time moves them so that they are alarmed and then comforted,"†—in which again we have an action of the mind and of the will, a *Verhalten*—"Do not reject it," which implies the power to accept it.

Now if we take all these passages together, we find in them not merely a distinct foreshadowing, but a clear expression, of a doctrine of Free-will that is in essential—almost in verbal—harmony and identity with that contained in the Confession. In other words, Melancthon's new doctrine of Free-will, which first appeared formally in 1527, and was still further developed during the next two years, has now become, and in 1530 is officially declared to be, the *Lutheran* doctrine of Free-will. The same ethical feature that manifestly characterizes this doctrine in Melancthon's private writings has been retained in the expression of it in the Confession. The author undoubtedly means to remove all excuse of indifference, and to awaken a sense of responsibility. For in the *Visitation Articles* he says that "men must be admonished to *arouse* themselves to seek assistance from God. Thus God will even *assist* the natural

* C. R. 15 : 444. Italics ours.

† Quoted from Herrlinger's *Die Theol. Melancthons*, p. 79.

gifts."* In the Confession it is taught that in becoming acceptable to God we have the grace, *assistance* and operation of the Holy Spirit. But in the *Annotations on Romans* he had denied, as to the end of his life he denied, that our works are in any sense meritorious, or are the cause of election †

IV. THE APOLOGY.

Next to the Confession the Apology is Melancthon's noblest monument. That he so often associated the two and reconfessed them as long as he lived, is proof positive that he saw nothing in either that conflicts with the other, and that his views underwent no material change during the last thirty years of his life. And the fact that in the last year of his life, while discussing the doctrine of Free-will, he appeals to his *Loci*,‡ is also proof positive that in his consciousness there is no difference between his own dogmatic teaching on Free-will and the teaching of the Church on the same subject. That is, at the same period of his life he reaffirms the teaching of the Church and his own dogmatic teaching. This fact assists us in interpreting the Confession and the Apology, for it is a principle universally recognized that creeds and confessions must be interpreted by the private writings of those who composed them and continue to reaffirm them.

In the Apology the article *De Libero Arbitrio* is treated rather cursorily, though "our adversaries" are impliedly condemned for teaching that "without the aid of the Holy Spirit men are able to love God and to keep his commandments as regards the substance of actions, and to merit grace and justification by works which reason effects *per se* without the Holy Spirit."§ It is also said: "Moreover if any sophist should cavil that righteousness is in the Will, therefore it cannot be assigned to faith, which is in the understanding, the reply is easy, since those in the schools also confess that the Will

* C. R. 26: 27.

† C. R. 15: 473-5. Italics ours.

‡ C. R. 9: 767.

§ Müller, 218, 68.

directs the understanding so that it assents (*ut assentiatur*)* to the Word of God. And we say more plainly: As the terror of sin and death are not only thoughts of the understanding, but also dreadful agitations of the Will fleeing the judgment of God, so faith is not only knowledge in the understanding, but also confidence in the Will, that is, it is *to will* and *to accept* that which is offered in the promise, viz., reconciliation and the remission of sins." † (*Italics ours*).

The first passage quoted above is, as regards the sense of it, in strict accord with the second part of the quotation from the Confession. The passage clearly implies that what men cannot do without the aid of the Holy Spirit, that they can do by the aid of the Holy Spirit, for the *doing* is that of men, but it must be steadily kept in mind that neither here nor elsewhere has Melanchthon taught that works can merit justification, or are in any sense a cause of justification. His doctrine of justification is *solifidian* from the beginning to the end of his theological career.

In the second passage quoted we have the declaration that the understanding "*assents* to the Word of God," and this is exactly what Melanchthon teaches in the *Loci* when he says that "the Will assents to the Word of God," for it makes no difference in the essence of the meaning whether it be said that the *Will* assents, or that the *understanding* assents. In either case it is the responsible *Ego* that *assents*, and every tyro in theology knows that there is no *saving* assent to the Word of God, except that which is both of the understanding and of the Will. In fact it is impossible to make a clear distinction between the faculties of understanding and Will, as acting separately and apart from each other, in the matter of faith. Faith is an action both of the understanding and of the Will. And it is also proper to note here the fact that in the Apology Melanchthon uses the same words, *assentiatur verbo*

* Says Harpers' *Latin Dictionary*: "Assentio=sentiendo se applicare, designates a friendly joining of one's self to any one. * * * So of conduct, *to yield*." Thus clearly the word designates not only an action of the mind (*mens*), but also an action of the will (*voluntas*).

† Müller, Art. III, 183.

Dei (and in the very same sense) that he uses in the *Loci Assentiens verbo Dei*. Why should Professor Pieper strain out the one and swallow the other? Why should he repudiate the *assentiens verbo Dei* of the *Loci* as "synergistic," and accept the *assentiatur verbo Dei* of the Apology as orthodox, and hold it as confessionally obligatory? We should like for him to answer these questions with arguments from the Scriptures. We say, "from the Scriptures," for Professor Pieper professes to prove his positions from the Scriptures alone.

But what will Professor Pieper do with the *velle et accipere hoc quod in promissione offertur, videlicet reconciliationem et remissionem peccatorum*?* For here it is evident that the Apology defines faith as *to wish* and *to accept* grace or the remission of sins. Is *velle* passive? By no means. According to Harpers' *Latin Dictionary* it is equivalent to "Germ. *wollen*; Engl. *will*, expressing an exercise of volition, and corresponding in most cases to German *wollen*; in Engl. mostly rendered *to wish, want, intend, purpose, propose, be willing, consent, will*"—all acts of that faculty of the human soul which chooses and determines. The word does not merely imply action; it *expresses* action. In this instance it means *to wish, to want*, the remission of sins. So also with the *accipere hoc*. To accept a thing is to act with reference to that thing; first to put forth a *volition* for that thing, and then to appropriate that thing to one's self. The influences and incentives leading up to the volition and the appropriation may be very powerful, but the volition and the appropriation are personal *acts*, and are so regarded by the self-consciousness, the court of final appeal in the premises, and are so treated by every legal tribunal in the world. In the case before us, faith, which is described as both knowledge in the understanding and confidence in the heart, "wishes and accepts reconciliation and remission of sins." In reality it is the human *Ego* that *wishes* and *accepts*. It is absurd to suppose that God or the Holy Ghost wishes and accepts *for* us, and it remains to be proved that they determine *our* acceptance as the vernal sun melts the snow, merely by affecting us with-

* Müller, Art. III, 183, where the Apology says that "faith is not only knowledge in the understanding, but confidence in the will."

out any action or volition, without any *Verhalten*, of our own. And it is deterministic to suppose that God determines the action of the Will, or the volition of man, in any other way than by personal influence exerted on the understanding and on the Will according to the fundamental laws of each, in cases like that under consideration, by drawing and persuading us, not by dragging and pushing us as blocks of wood are dragged and pushed, but by causing us to "know the truth," which truth, according to Lutheran teaching, has its own energizing efficiency, and is the instrument by which the Holy Spirit is given, "who, in his own time and place, works faith in those who hear the Gospel," but so that "conversion"—and there can be no conversion without faith—"is in part a work of grace, and in part a work (*Leistung*) of man," as the venerable Dr. Luthardt expresses it.* Or as described by Thomasius: "Faith denotes the decisive moment in which the salvation-applying activity of the Divine Spirit becomes the salvation-appropriating activity of the human spirit. It is the act of the human personality brought about by the Holy Spirit, by virtue of which the human personality turns itself to the grace of God in Christ in order to take it (grace) over to itself; consequently it is the point of union of the divine working of grace and of the human self-determination called forth by grace, God's work and gift, and at the same time man's own act, his own, free, personal *Verhalten* (I believe.*)"†

In describing faith as *velle et accipere reconciliationem*, etc., and as *obedientia erga evangelium*‡ Melancthon is not supposed to be juggling with words, nor to be ignorant of the meaning of the words used by him. The just, not to say the charitable, supposition is that he used words according to their grammatico-historical meaning, and that he knew that meaning. It devolves upon Professor Pieper and his theological confreres to show that by the *ut assentiatur verbo Dei* and the *velle et accipere hoc* and the *obedientia erga evangelium* Melancthon meant to teach the *absolute passivity* of the human understand-

* *Kompendium der Dogmatik*, seventh Ed. p. 254.

† *Person und Werk Christi*, II, third ed. p. 385.

‡ Müller, Art. Iff, p. 187.

ing and Will in conversion, and in believing (including the *prima initia fidei*), and in the appropriation of salvation; or rather, that he meant to teach that there is no such thing as the *appropriation* of salvation, only an *application* which overcomes the most obstinate resistance. As to what Melanchthon means by the *assentiens verbo Dei* in the *Loci*, Professor Pieper professes to know. He ought therefore to know what these words mean in the Apology. Dr. Thomasius, who will be accepted as good authority wherever THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY is read, except in the Missouri camp, quotes with approbation from the Apology the passages we have quoted, especially the *assentiatur verbo Dei*, and the *velle et accipere* italicized, and says: "The identical propositions are repeated by Melanchthon in the *Loci* in the following definitions: 'Faith is assent (*assentiri*) to the entire Word of God as it is set forth to us, and to the promise of gratuitous reconciliation as given for the sake of Christ, and is confidence in the mercy of God as promised for the sake of Christ the Mediator; '*—thus at once identifying the teaching of Melanchthon in the Apology and the teaching of the same Melanchthon in the *Loci* of the third period (1543-1559) on the all-important subject of Free-will in its attitude (*Verhalten*) toward the Word of God and the promise of salvation. And it is also worthy of note that in this same connection Thomasius defines *fiducia* as "special, personal *appropriation* of the promised salvation" (italics ours). Hence: Inasmuch as the Apology is a formal exposition and defense of the Confession, it must follow that the *assentiri verbo Dei* and the *velle et accipere reconciliationem* tell us what Melanchthon meant by the *Hilfe* and *accipitur* of the Confession; otherwise the Apology is a fraud and a deception. But the first pair of words given above as clearly and as unmistakably set forth volitional action as does the *uxorem velle ducere*.

THEREFORE, ETC.

The only difference is this: In the *uxorem*, etc., the Will acts by its natural powers. In the other case the Will acts under

* *Person und Werk*, 3 ed., II, p. 402.

the influence of the Word and of the Holy Spirit. But in both cases the Will *acts*.

The dilemma in which this conclusion places Professor Pieper needs no explanation.

V. THE PROMOTION THESES.

In 1537 Melanchthon wrote *The Disputation* for the examination of a candidate for promotion in theology. The promotions, as they were called, were official transactions conducted under the auspices of the theological Faculty, and were attended by immense crowds, consisting of theologians, professors, superintendents, preachers and students.* The candidate on this occasion defended *inter alia* the following theses composed by Melanchthon, and officially submitted: "Our will is not active without the Holy Spirit, but when by the Gospel it arouses and comforts itself, it is assisted by the Holy Spirit.

"For it must be truly established that we acquire the benefits of the Gospel, in which also is the gift of the Holy Spirit.

"Since we begin with the Word, men must be taught to resist their natural unbelief.

"I do not approve the Manichæans, who attribute no activity to the human will, not even when assisted by the Holy Spirit.

"I am pleased with the dictum of Augustine, who says: He assists those who receive the gift of calling with becoming piety, and preserve the blessings of God in them, as far as man can.

"Therefore also the blessing of God must be recognized, in that the promise is general, and that it is the will of God to save all. And care and diligence must be aroused in us, so that we do not indulge our natural unbelief, but resist it."†

Here is "Synergism" full-fledged, "set forth and faithfully explicated in the school by Philip Melanchthon," and defended by some candidate in the presence of a multitude of witnesses. What does all this signify? Does it signify that the doctrine

*Haussleiter, *Aus der Schule Melanchthons*, p. IV.

† C. R. 12:481.

of Free-will contained in the Form of Concord dominated Wittenberg in 1537?

VI. THE VARIATA.

In the year 1540 Melanchthon issued a new edition of the Augsburg Confession, which is now generally mentioned as the *Variata*. It is an established fact that no one found fault with this edition of the Confession so long as Melanchthon lived.* It was used by official authorization at diets and colloquies from that of Worms in 1541 to that of Worms in 1557. It was ordered, revised and approved by Luther, and was called by him the "dear Confession." Melanchthon, acting in an official capacity, declared that the meaning was not changed, "though in the later edition some things have been either more mildly expressed or have been better explained." Even Melanchthon's most violent enemies, the Flacianists, used it without hesitation. At the Naumburg Convention of Princes in 1561 it was endorsed as "the same Confession somewhat more stately and elaborate, repeated, and also explained and enlarged on the basis of the Holy Scriptures."† Its title page declared it to be the "Confession delivered to the Emperor Charles V at Augsburg, anno MDXXX." There can be no doubt, then, that what it teaches was endorsed both privately and officially for at least twenty years as the doctrine of the Lutheran Church.

In the eighteenth article of the *Variata* we read as follows: "Concerning Free-will they (the churches) teach that man's will has some liberty to work civil righteousness, and to choose such things as reason can attain unto; but it has no power without the Holy Spirit to work spiritual righteousness, because Paul says: 'The animal man perceiveth not the things of the Spirit of God,' and Christ says: 'Without me ye can do nothing.' Now spiritual righteousness is wrought in us when we are helped by the Holy Spirit. Moreover, we receive the Holy Spirit when we assent to the Word of God, so that

* See Strobel, *Apologie Melanchthons*, p. 94. Weber, *Kritische Geschichte, A. C.*, II, pp. 508-9. THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY, Oct. 1898.

† Weber, II, *Beilage*, II.

through faith we are comforted in terrors of conscience, as Paul teaches when he says: 'That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.' "

The teaching especially to be noted here is embraced in the words: "When we *are helped* by the Holy Spirit," and "when we *assent* to the Word of God." The first quotation reminds us of the words, "grace, assistance, operation of the Holy Spirit," found in the so-called *Invariata*. Such a declaration does not imply absolute passivity in us. When I am *helped* to do a thing, or to attain to an end, or to become what I have not heretofore been, I am supposed to be in some sense *active*. I am supposed at least to *accept* the help that is proffered. I am ill beyond the reach of self-restoration. I learn of a sovereign remedy. I am visited by a competent physician. I must at least *accept* the remedy, I must *submit* to the operation of the physician, and must follow his counsel, otherwise restoration to health will not be effected in me. All this involves the action of my will, though all the merit of my restoration is due to the physician and to the efficiency of the remedy. At least so much is involved in the *usus loquendi* when it is said that something is wrought in us by the *help* of another.

And as for the second quotation: "When we assent to the Word of God," here we have the identical words used already in the Apology, and employed subsequently by Melanchthon in the *Loci: assentiri verbo Dei*. The *assenting* is a personal act. *We* assent, and our assenting to the Word of God is the condition upon which we receive the Holy Spirit.* Beyond question this is good Lutheran doctrine. Why should Professor Pieper object to it? It was accepted by all Lutherans so long as Melanchthon lived, and it was only after he was dead and gone that a few fanatics scented heresy in this eighteenth article of the *Variata* which *in singulis et in omnibus* had been preëminently the Lutheran Confession. It is still good Lutheran doctrine that spiritual righteousness is wrought in us when we are *helped* by the Holy Spirit; and we receive the Holy Spirit when we *assent* to the Word of God. We cannot conceive that the theologians—Melanchthon, Brentz, Andreae, Runge, *et. al.*—who met each other at Worms in 1557 and

made their declaration of abiding adherence to the Augsburg Confession (*Variata*) and to the Apology were not Lutherans, or were Lutherans in every doctrine except in that of Free-will. Nor can we suppose that these men did not know the meaning of the article in question, or that they consciously or unconsciously read into it the doctrine of *absolute passivity*. If Professor Pieper thinks they did, let him prove it, and thus make an end of controversy on this point.

VII. THE CONFESSIO SAXONICA.*

In the year 1551 Melanchthon, in obedience to a command of his Elector, prepared *The Repetition of the Augsburg Confession*, commonly called *Confessio Saxonica*. In the first paragraph of the preface the author declares: "We mean simply and faithfully to reiterate the sum of the doctrine which is preached in all the churches that embrace the Confession of the Reverend Dr. Luther, and we repeat the doctrine of the Confession which was presented to the Emperor Charles at the Diet of Augsburg in the year 1530, although some things are here more fully recited."

The name under which this Confession is exhibited at once inspires confidence. It is not a new confession, but simply the Augsburg Confession *repeated* and amplified. In a convention of Lutheran theologians assembled at Wittenberg this Confession was subjected to the most rigid scrutiny, and was then signed and endorsed by synods, universities, superintendents and theologians (including John Brentz)† from Pomerania to Strassburg. It was often published separately and again and again in connection with the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, and the Württemberg Confession of 1552, and in various *Corpora Doctrinae*.‡ It is a genuine Lutheran Confession.

* C. R. 28 : 327-468.

† Salig, I, 671-3, who very correctly remarks. "Many princes and counts had sent their theologians to Wittenberg. These carefully perused the Confession, pronounced it to be in harmony with the Augsburg Confession, and subscribed it as a genuine symbolical book. If Melanchthon's doctrine at that time had not been recognized as the genuine Lutheran doctrine, it would not have been approved. But the evidences were yet there, and they could not be denied."

‡ C. R. 28 : 346 *et seqq.* Subscriptions, *Ibid.* pp. 457-468.

and was so regarded by all Lutherans of the time except that after a long while Flacius* found some fault with its definition of righteousness, but not with the teaching on Free-will.

In the article on Free-will the *Saxonica* says: "Man is by no means able to free himself from sin and eternal death by his natural powers, but this liberation and conversion of man to God, and spiritual renewal, are effected through the Son of God who quickens us by the Holy Spirit, as it has been said: 'If any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.' And the Will when the Holy Spirit has been accepted is not now inactive."

There can be no reasonable question as to the meaning of this passage. The subject treated is conversion. This is effected by the Son of God and by the Holy Spirit, but the Spirit must *be accepted*. The sentences, "When the Spirit is given," "When the Spirit is conceived," "When the Spirit is accepted," "Drawn by the Spirit," are of frequent occurrence in Melanchthon's treatment of conversion. When the Holy Spirit is given through the Word, and is accepted, the Will is not now, is not under these circumstances, *inactive*, *jam non est otiosa*—this last sentence being also of frequent occurrence in Melanchthon's treatment of conversion. And that the last refuge of doubt as to Melanchthon's meaning in this passage may be removed, we now quote the paragraph that immediately follows the one quoted above: "We do not therefore speak of an inactive (*otiosa*) knowledge, and they err who think that remission of sins occurs in the inactive (*otiosis*), without any action of the mind, without any struggle and without any perception of consolation in real terrors, in that age which is now able to understand the Word of doctrine, as is said: 'Faith comes from hearing, hearing from the Word of God.' And because we set forth consolation to consciences in penitence, we do not here add questions about predestination, or about Election, but we lead all readers to the Word of God, and we bid them learn God's will from his Word, as the Eternal Father has expressly enjoined: 'Hear ye him.' Let them not indulge in other speculations. It is most certain

* *C. R.* 9:105.

that the preaching of repentance appertains to all men and accuses all men. So also the promise is general, and offers remission of sins to all, according to those general (*universalia*) declarations: 'Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavily laden, and I will give you rest,' and in John 3, 'That whosoever believeth on him might not perish, but have everlasting life,' Rom. 10, 'Whosoever believeth on him shall not be confounded.' Also: 'The Lord of all, who is rich toward all who call upon him.' Rom. 11: 'God hath concluded all under disobedience that he might have mercy on all.' Let each one include himself in this general (*universalis*) promise and not indulge in unbelief, but strive that he may assent to the Word of God, and obey the Holy Spirit, and pray for assistance, as thus it is said: 'By how much more will he give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him!'"

Then immediately follows the article on Conversion and the Will, from which we first quoted. In the longer quotation it is clearly affirmed that remission does not occur in those who are *inactive*, without an *action* of the mind, without a *struggle*, without *assenting to the Word of God* (*assentiri verbo Dei*) without prayer, without obeying the Holy Spirit. Activity is affirmed in almost every sentence. In addition the *Saxonica* is explicit and pronounced on the subject of the all-inclusiveness of the divine promise of redemption. The will of God is an open will. It is set forth in the Divine Word. It is not limited by any secret decree of particularistic election. It offers remission of sins to all men. It makes salvation dependent upon faith, and "by faith is meant confidence acquiescing in the Son of God, the Propitiator, for the sake of whom we are received, and we do not please on account of our own virtues or the fulfilling of the law."

We say now for the sake of emphasis that this Confession was most widely received in the Lutheran Church. It professes to be "the consensus of the true Catholic Church of God," "to recite the meaning of the Augsburg Confession and the common consent of these churches." The Brandenburg theologians declared it to be "in words and sentences not only Christian, pure, correct and in harmony with our sacred Augs-

burg Confession and the *Loci Communes*, but also somewhat clearer and stronger." John Wigand, who later became a Flacianist, and Andrew Theobold, both legates from Mansfeld, "find, thank God! and confess that this writing is in harmony with the Augsburg Confession, and states thoroughly and clearly the doctrines of the most important articles of the Christian faith." The ministers and professors at Strassburg testify, each one with his own hand subscribing, "that it is in accord with the one true doctrine of the essence and will of God." The Synod of Hither Pomerania "affirms before God and all Saints in heaven and on earth that our Confession is the true and perpetual consensus of the Catholic Church of the Son of God."* In a word, it is the Augsburg Confession repeated and expounded. It shows how the Augsburg Confession was understood at that time, and what it was believed to teach.

Certainly this leaves scarcely anything to be desired in our contention. But inasmuch as some of the subscribers refer to the *Loci*,† and speak of Melanchthon in the most affectionate terms as "our beloved preceptor," we turn now to the private teaching of the great Preceptor during two decades before the appearance of the *Saxonica*.

VIII. MELANCHTHON—1530—1550.

In *The Commentary on Romans*, (1532) to "the scruple of particularity" Melanchthon opposes "the general promises," and declares that we must not judge of the will of God by the reason without the Word of God. "They are justified who believe, and they are elected who do not resist the call, but believe the Gospel, and persevere to the end," thus clearly making election dependent on faith. Again: "Let no one scrutinize the secret majesty of God, but let him behold the God who calls by the promise, and let him lay hold of his will in the Word, which is general. As Paul says: It is not of him that willeth nor of him that runneth, but of God who showeth

* The Commendations and Subscriptions are found in *C. R.* 28: pp. 457-468.

† *Ibid.*, p. 462.

mercy, that is, mercy is the cause of election. It is not ours to will and to run, and yet these things take place in the Will, in him who runs, and does not resist."* And in the argument of the Epistle he says: "Faith is not only knowledge, but assent, for which also an action of the Will is required, which is to desire (*velle*) and to accept the promise, and to acquiesce in it. But this faith is conceived when we assent to the promise of the Gospel, with which the alarmed mind comforts itself, the Holy Spirit at the same time by the Word moving the heart to believe."†

Clearly enough this passage posits an action of the Will in the appropriation of salvation, but of the Will as moved by the Holy Spirit, who through the Word moves the heart, but the motion is that of the human Will, and consequently possesses something of that ethical content which Melancthon, beginning in 1527, constantly ascribed to Conversion.

Already in 1533 Melancthon had established the closest connection between predestination and justification: "When we inquire concerning justification we begin with the Word, so when we inquire concerning predestination we must begin with the Word and the Gospel," says he in the *Loci* of 1533.‡ Much stress is also here laid on the universality of the promise, until at length it is said: "Since it must be affirmed that the promise is indeed general as regards the Will of God, so that *a posteriori* in justification we say that there is some cause in the recipient, not worthiness, forsooth, but because he lays hold of the promise, with which, as Paul says, the Holy Spirit is active. Faith comes by hearing. So also in regard to election we judge *a posteriori*, that beyond doubt those are elected who lay hold of mercy, and persevere in that confidence to the end." It is evident that Melancthon opposes all thoughts of particularistic election. He connects predestination with faith in a causal, though not meritorious relation. He denies that there are contradictory wills in God, declares that mercy is the cause of election, denies that God is a respecter of persons. No-

* *C. R.* 15: p. 680.

† *Ibid.* p. 544.

‡ *C. R.* 21: 330.

where, indeed, does he connect election with any secret activity of God, but always with faith and with perseverance in faith.

Now the bearing of all this on Free-will is evident, since Melancthon never tires of affirming that man must *assent* to the Gospel.

But all these books were published, and this teaching was delivered *ex cathedra* at Wittenberg, years before Luther died, and yet we look in vain for a single word of protest from the great man who ruled things at Wittenberg as with a rod of iron. On the contrary, not only by his silence, but by his laudations of Melancthon's books he in effect endorsed those views of Free-will and of Predestination, even in extravagant terms. Of the *Loci* of 1535 he said to the Wittenberg students: "Read Philip's *Loci* next to the Bible. In this most excellent book the pure theology is taught in a quiet and orderly way. Augustine, Bernard, Bonaventura, Lyra, Gabriel Biel, Staupitz, have much that is good; but Master Philip can explain the Scriptures and present their meaning in brief compass."* Think of it! "Next to the Bible!" and then he lauds Melancthon above the greatest theological doctors of all preceding ages. And that is not all. Only a couple weeks before his death he wrote: "Should Philip be taken from the University half the students will leave on account of his absence."† Still more: In the Preface (1545) to the first edition of his own works he extols "Philip's *Loci Communes*" above all other works on systematic divinity, saying finally of his beloved friend: "What God hath wrought through this instrument, not only in literature, but in theology, his own works sufficiently testify." And yet in the editions of the *Loci* of 1535 and 1543 Melancthon had written in regard to conversion: "Three causes are conjoined: the Word, the Holy Spirit, and the Will not wholly inactive (*non sane otiosa*), but resisting its own weakness," and had said: "Only will, and God anticipates," and: "God draws, but draws him who is willing," and in the latter edition had used the *assentiens, nec repugnans verbo Dei*

* Matthesins, *Twelfth Sermon*.

† C. R. 6 : 10; De Wette, 5 : 774.

(which is so repugnant to Professor Pieper), and had declared that "the Will is not as a statue, and that spiritual emotion is not impressed upon it as though it were a statue."

Well, we leave Professor Pieper to make the proper comments. Perhaps he will say that neither Melanchthon, nor Luther at that time, was a good Lutheran; that both had forsaken the pure doctrine, and had begun to anticipate "modern theology, which is through and through *dishonest*," while its "entire standpoint is a *huge lie*."* Perhaps he will say in addition, "Had I been at Wittenberg I would not have held common prayer with either of them. Away with them! Give me Flacius."

But while awaiting Professor Pieper's comment we may be permitted to say: The doctrine of Free-will that now (1530-1551) prevailed in the Lutheran Church and was accepted by the Lutheran Church, is found in the official documents, and in the private writings of Melanchthon, quoted on the preceding pages. Against this doctrine no Lutheran voice was raised during the period. All alike subscribed the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, and all alike praised and lauded the *Loci*. "In June 1549 Flacius wrote Melanchthon: 'As little as I can wish my own destruction, so little do I wish that of your *Loci*.' And Tilmann Hesshusius said in an address: 'As in his commentaries on the Scriptures Philip has surpassed all other writers of the Church, so in his *Loci* has he surpassed himself.' Calvin seems to be the only person who was not satisfied with Melanchthon's teaching on Predestination and Free-will."† In 1559 Melanchthon wrote to his elector: "During the life-time of Luther and afterwards I rejected those *Stoic and Manichean deliria*, that Luther and others had written, namely, that all works, good and evil, in all men, good and evil, must occur as they do. It is evident that such speech is contrary to God's Work, is destructive of all discipline, and is blasphemous toward God."‡ And in order to show that Luther had in practice abandoned the absoluteness of his

* "F. P." in *Lehre und Wehre*, May 1904, p. 198.

† Dr. Carl Schmidt, *Philipp Melanchthon*, p. 574.

‡ *C. R.* 9: p. 766.

theory of Predestination, he refers also to his (Luther's) *Trost-schriften*, and letters, and says: "I and others in his presence have often heard him comfort others thus: You must hold to the promise, which is *universalis*, and we must not exclude ourselves."*

What shall we say then? The Lutheran Church had now passed beyond its formative period. It was established; it was organized; it had a distinctive confessional system; it had commentaries on the Scriptures, and it had a hand-book on theology which had almost the authority of a confession of faith and was often called *opus sacrosanctum*. Its doctrine of Free-will was as clearly defined and was as universally accepted by its members as was its doctrine of the Person and Work of Christ. But in this doctrine of Free-will the harsh expressions employed by Luther in the heat of controversy do not appear. Luther did not make any part of the *De Servo Arbitrio*, nor any part of the Commentary on the ninetieth Psalm, confessional, nor is he known to have uttered one word of complaint against anything that Melancthon wrote on the subject of Free-will after 1527. On the contrary, as it is conceded, he materially modified his earlier views in the interest of practical Christianity. More and more he emphasized the doctrine of the *Deus revelatus*, and of the *vocatio universalis*, and the article of justification by faith alone,† so that in his riper years his theology is represented pre-eminently by these three principles just now named. His earlier doctrine of Free-will is practically supplanted by what Melancthon, in the interest of the ethical content of conversion, has for many years taught on this subject. His own earlier teaching on this subject, as already shown, though not formally revoked by him, has been allowed to fall into the back-ground—rather, to be thoroughly superseded in practice.

We now ask, is it just, is it honest, is it honorable, toward Luther to force into a Lutheran confession, words and phrases about Free-will, and in reality a doctrine of Free-will in its relation to conversion, which Luther did not desiderate in the

* *Ibid.* p. 769.

† See *The Lutheran Quarterly*, April, 1903, pp. 195 *et seqq.*

Augsburg Confession and in the Apology, and which he did not place in his Catechisms, nor in the Schmalcald Articles, and which he did not rebuke his followers for rejecting? Is it obligatory upon us to-day, in order to insure our standing as Lutherans, to affirm that in spiritual matters man is like a block, a stone, a pillar of salt, a lifeless image, which has neither organs nor senses, and that in conversion he is even worse than a block or a stone, and is "absolutely passive," when no such descriptions and conceptions appeared in any Lutheran confession until half a century after the Lutheran Church was established, not until long after those who had written and those who had subscribed her earlier confessions and Catechisms, had ceased from their labors on earth—not until after some vengeful scholastics had fought over Luther's dead bones and had sought to canonize the very clothes that he wore? Is it un-Lutheran to express the wish, with Thomasius and other good Lutherans,* that "the Flacian truncus and lapis, as endangering moral responsibility"—and we add, that such a Flacian conception of Free-will, as a whole†—had not found place in the Form of Concord? These questions we place before our readers in all seriousness, and to this we are specially moved by the fact that Article II, *De Libero Arbitrio*, of the Form of Concord, is to a very large extent responsible for one of the most violent controversies, and for some of the most hurtful schisms, that have distracted and are now distracting the American Lutheran Church. It is idle to say that *truncus* and *lapis*, and the theory of Free-will for which these words stand, and which they represent, are reconcilable with the older confessions. Such reconciliation was attempted by the framers of the Form of Concord, but their procedure was like that of placing the cart before the horse. They tried to reconcile the

* See. Herzog's *Real-Encyc.* 2 ed. XV, p. 112.

† In the year 1561 Flacius published a book entitled, *Wahafftige und beständige Meinung und Zeugniß von der Erbesunde und dem Freien Willen*. In this book we have essentially the same doctrine of Free-will that we find in the Form of Concord. The doctrine and the particular and characteristic phraseology of the two works are so strikingly alike as to make it morally certain that the former is not only the presupposition of the latter, but that it furnished not a little material for the latter.

older confessions with the Form of Concord, and this they did after they had posited an extract from Augustine's *De Praedestinatione*, and certain extracts from and references to Luther—the like to which are not found in the Augsburg Confession, nor in the Apology, nor in the Catechisms, nor in the Greater Confession, nor in the Schmalkald Articles—as an authoritative standard, and had made premises of their own; or rather, had accepted the Flacian premises as normative.* In other words, they read a strong affirmation of Augustine's about grace, and some of Luther's most extreme dicta about Free-will, and "the Flacian view of things," into the older confessions, and thus tried to force a meaning into those confessions, which, when they are interpreted historically, they are found incapable of bearing.

Who for one moment can suppose that Melanchthon meant to put the characteristic Form of Concord doctrine of Free-will in the Augsburg Confession and in the Apology? Who can suppose that when near the close of his life he reaffirmed his

* Thomasius says that the expression, "stock," or "stone," 'belongs very particularly to the Flacian view of things,' and that notwithstanding the effort of the F. C. to guard against misunderstanding, nevertheless it "threatens to lead back to the conception that the subject of conversion is impersonal." He says "that Luther used the expression only incidentally." *Das Bekenntniss*, p. 144. Schmidt says that the Flacianists took "Luther's fundamental principle of Free-will, and consequently of absolute necessity as their chief dogma; from which they developed their system, not psychologically and ethically as Melanchthon did, but purely in a dialectic way. They inquired more for the logical consequence than for the needs of the heart," and went "not further than to scholastic definitions and rigid formulae." *Philipp Melanchthon*, pp. 574-576. Luthardt says that the word "block," as applied to man in conversion, belongs characteristically to Flacianism. He regards its selection as unfortunate, though the Form of Concord could not avoid referring to it; "but it ought to have declined and counselled against its continued use." *Die Lehre von Freien Willen*, p. 272.

G. Frank says: "The Form of Concord settled the (synergistic) controversy essentially in the sense of Flacius." Herzog, 2nd ed. XV., p. III. Flacius wrote several tractates on Free-will, in which he gave dogmatic and systematic form to Luther's harsh, but often rhetorical, statements. It is Luther partizanized by Flacius who speaks in Article II of the Form of Concord, rather than the true, genuine Luther; though there is still a Melanchthon element in the article.

adherence to those confessions he did so knowing or believing that they contain the *truncus* and *lapis* doctrine of Free-will, or even the germs of that doctrine, since in his *Loci* and elsewhere he had so persistently repudiated that doctrine? And who can suppose that Luther meant to place that doctrine in the Catechisms and in the Schmalkald Articles, since in those writings he did not employ either the language or the *ratio disserendi* which are peculiar to that doctrine, and which are made so prominent in the writings of those who insist on the *truncus-lapis* doctrine? And who can conclude that when Melancthon and others signed the Schmalkald Articles in 1537 they did so knowing and believing that said Articles teach and are intended to teach that doctrine about Free-will which is found in the Form of Concord?

Upon him who affirms rests the burden of proof.

[To be Continued.]

ARTICLE II.

THE NEGLECTED FACTOR IN POPULAR EDUCATION.

BY PROFESSOR DAVID H. BAUSLIN, D. D.

Every age, it is to be presumed, has at the time appeared to be an exceptional age. Every chapter of history that marks an epoch has its own caption, which, while it may not be definitely announced, is always evolved in the progress of the narration. Each era works at the solution of its own problems. It is the plainest of truths that the men of this generation are striving to solve the problem of life on the material side and multitudes of people are accordingly occupied, primarily and continually, with things that can be reduced to rigid and accurate demonstration. Sometime possibly in our national development we shall be obliged to learn that a real man is something more than his money or his office or his trade. But as matters now look absolute secularism is commended by many as the only true basis for the organization of human society, and as the only sort of a line along which a man should make his thinking, his planning and working to proceed. It is the dominance of this spirit that induces many of our most gifted men to hitch themselves to the drays of commerce and the machinery of manufacture where they are goaded on, and driven to death by the tyranny of competition and ceaseless exaction.

It would be surprising did not this dominating and remorseless spirit invade other spheres than the distinctively commercial. It has done so; and we are today in the midst of a contest between the religious and the non religious or secularist view of life's meaning and ideals. There is even danger that our state schools, a most important and fundamental factor in our national life, shall become nurseries of this secularism. In the popular estimate the public school system of this country is looked upon as something like unto the ark of the Lord in the days of Uzza and Obbededom, a thing not to be touched. But if we love our country, we should not be afraid to speak even

unpleasant truth in a time when it has grown to be something of a fashion to at least cajole the people, as in a former time men lied to kings. Though the maxim of John Winthrop in its literal sense may no longer be true, and especially in our country, that the civil state is reared out of the church, yet the principle involved is eternally and unchangeably true, for in the life of the civic state and social community complete secularism is both ruinous and suicidal. The spiritual and temporal can never be entirely divorced without disastrous consequences. Men may do away with an established church, as we deem them wise in doing, but they can never emancipate themselves from the restraints and incentives of pure and undefiled religion in the spheres of either commerce, community life or pedagogics without involving themselves in direful calamities as the resultant of their folly. To hold that there is no God and no immortal human soul, and yet for purely utilitarian purposes, to educate men to believe in God and in the soul only because such teaching has a social value, that is a gross outrage and a world-wide imposture. But on the other hand to hold that God is, and that the soul is the man and is forever enduring and yet to decline to make your system of public education conformable to this belief, that too is a fatal pedagogic blunder and an outrage. Education is any effort to assist the development of an immature human being toward social adjustment and efficiency. But we cannot rest in this definition unless we are willing to say that the proper goal of life is simply social adjustment and efficiency and nothing more than this. But certainly in any proper definition that is comprehensive enough to include all that is involved, education cannot accept as its end anything less than the highest destiny that a man is capable of. It must necessarily have something to do with the goal of life, whatever that goal may be. "The true end of teaching," as one has said, "is one with the true aim of life." Our schools have frequently been eulogized as the source of our strength and glory. The little red school house and the big city high school have been complacently contemplated as doing wonders, and the college and university as crowning the high

range of intellectualism. But notwithstanding all this, distinguished college presidents and educators in the land are constantly lifting up admonitory voices and speaking of certain tendencies with alarm. They seem to be haunted by the fear that in certain of its features our educational development is going heels over head into some new ways which will not end in producing the man for the hour. It is not at all clear to many of the best informed men on the subject that the vast amounts of money which the public is spending on its schools are bringing a proper return in increased security from crime, improved citizenship and purification of politics. From our large cities boys just out of the schools are going in squads to the reformatories or penitentiaries, and some to the gallows. It can do no harm to make at least some induction into the facts in a case of such fundamental importance.

Modern democracy had its origin in the revolt against political and religious tyranny. Altruistic revolutionists imagined that the overthrow of mediaeval theology was the end of all religion. The religious reformers, however, aimed their blows at papal supremacy only and still clung to the idea that some sort of union between democracy and religion was essential to civilization. In this country the limits fixed by European reformers were finally disregarded and the separation of church and state achieved and in consequence of this divorcement there has been a steady movement toward the secularization of some of the most important factors that are at work among us. Dividing the world into the secular and the sacred there has come to pass the denial of the religious factor in the industrial, political and educational affairs of the country. True it is that the philosophy and ideals of the secularists entirely fail to grasp the unity of the moral, intellectual and material elements of all true progress. Nevertheless the divorcement is insisted upon. The need of our times as it seems to us is not any formal and organic reunion of church and state but a more hearty recognition within our borders of the importance of the religious factor not only in the church but in the training accorded at great expense, to the coming citizenship of the country.

We do not ask for the transfer of trades unions and public schools to the priest to mold and control them according to mediaeval standards, but for a recognition of the religious factor as a thing of primary importance to the civic and industrial life, to the material as well as moral welfare of organized society. The line of safety lies in the recognition of the unity of man's life, so much so at least, that the secular be not permitted to entirely crowd out the sacred. The broadening relation of the state to the citizen makes the ethical side of education far more important than in other years. The educated men and women who will be called to share in the duties of the state and citizen should be more than clever and bright. They should also be philanthropic, benevolent, altruistic with a deep sympathy with the moral and spiritual needs of society. A true education will proceed upon the truth and principle that the foundation of all genuine culture must be moral character which is grounded in the spiritual nature. A leading article of its faith will be this—that the interests of society are not conserved by a system which turns out trained or stuffed intellects minus conscience and an intellectual athlete who is a moral dwarf. It will plead for a curriculum that mediates, renovates and furnishes the nature of the student from the physical, up through the social, commercial and ethical to the full height of the religious, evolving him into, not a segment of a man, but a full orb'd man. It differs from the "intellectual" education of Herbert Spencer as the civilization of Rome and Greece differs from modern christian civilization. It differs in its broadening fulness and the sweep of its purposes in respect to the character of the student. It is not to be mistaken for theology, for that is only one of the scientific grooves in which the mind of man runs. It is not Homiletics; for that is an art of a particular vocation. It is not a training in church creeds, not instruction in "Evangelism," not a course in Bible study in a special sense. These not unimportant tasks belong to their special schools of instruction. The education of which I speak works to develop every faculty, to call out every power, and perfect every possibility that is in man. It emphasizes its work in proportion to the

importance of its aim. If it accentuates religious and ethical culture it is because a good man is of more value to the world than a clever or a smart man.

In harmony with these principles what, we may ask, is education? It is the drawing out or development of man's powers harmoniously and in due proportion for his complete living in relation to himself, to society and to God. Plato says that education is "the perfection of man's powers;" Herbert Spencer that "it prepares man for complete living;" President Hyde, of Bowdoin College, says: "It fits one to earn his living by the exercise of trained powers, to support the institutions of society by intelligent appreciation of their worth, and to enjoy the products of art and civilization through the imagination and taste." President Butler says: "It is the adaptation of a person, a self-conscious being, to his environment, and the development of capacity in a person to modify and control that environment." This environment to which allusion is made in President Butler's definition may be separated into two divisions, including the physical and the spiritual. Under the last named division then would be included that accretion in knowledge and its resultant in habits and in conduct to which, in turn, when society is considered in its corporate aspects, we assign the name of civilization. This spiritual environment may further be divided into a five-fold classification viz., the scientific, the literary, the artistic, institutional life and religious beliefs. A man's education in the comprehensive sense includes all of these, and drop out any one factor in the classification and your training is defective, partial and lop-sided. Says Prof. George Albert Coe, who has written much recently on educational topics: "The ethical end is not thought of as the far-off culmination of one's education, but as an idea that is to be realized in every step of the educational progress. The child is to grow continuously in the moral, as in the intellectual life, and these two aspects of life are regarded as being properly inseparable." "There is a larger sense of the term education, according to which it designates everything that enters into the process of shaping the character of the child, and finally every-

thing that shapes mankind in the large." Again Prof. Monroe, the author of "The Educational Ideal," says: "The question to be asked at the end of an educational step is not, what has the child learned? but what has the child become?" According to John Henry Pestalozzi, the great Swiss educator, and one of the strongest figures ever prominent in the school room, education is a primary means for the regeneration of society, and that it reaches society through the individual and that it means for the individual the promotion of a normal development. "Sound education" he said, "stands before me symbolized by a tree planted near fertilizing waters. A little seed, which contains the design of the tree, its form and proportions, is placed in the soil. See how it germinates and expands into trunk, branches, leaves, flowers, and fruit! The whole tree is an uninterrupted chain of organic parts, the plan of which existed in its seed and roots."

Education accordingly, as defined and described by these and other great masters among pedagogues, includes the development and training of all man's powers and factors, the physical, the psychical and the religious. It comprehends the acquisition of all the kinds of knowledge needed for growth and guidance, enjoyment and character and the attainment of skill in the application of this power and knowledge of all the purposes of life. A true education seeks to call out the whole man in his highest harmonious development. That it often falls short of this highest aim, must of course be granted; but to this ideal it must nevertheless be held, and any education must be regarded as defective in just that degree in which it fails to accomplish this lofty aim.

Education is thus to be regarded as something more than the cultivation of the power of attention, the tension or stretching of the mind towards any subject; that concentration of all the powers of the mind on the one thing before it and the making of that the luminous burning focus of its thought.

Again it is to be regarded as something more than the development of accurate observation, keen perception, that focusing of the mind on a subject it must learn so that it may see

what is there, the clearing up into order of the confused field of fact into sharp outlines and definite relations.

And so again true education is to be looked upon as something more than training in correct reasoning. Perception sees the facts; reason sees relations. This relating power of the mind finds the threads of connection that bind all things into a system and traces events back to their causes and forward to consequences. It puts things together and frames judgments. From the known or the visible it leaps to the unknown or the hidden. This is something of education but not all of it. If one has acquired these three things, attention, accurate observation and correct reasoning, he has acquired some of the fundamentals of education, but not all of them.

The question then recurs, what provision is made in our popular educational methods for the discipline of that other part of a mans complex nature, the dominant factor which we call the spiritual? It raises the old question whether or not the Bible and the elements of theological truth should be taught in the public schools? Those who answer this question in the negative, and advocate a pure secular system of education, do so always upon one of two assumptions. The first is that the state is a purely secular body, which has no sort of business with religion and, therefore, cannot in any measure teach it; the second that instruction in such matters, including the reading of the Scriptures, must necessarily possess a certain character, and should be excluded as an offence to at least the minority of the community. But this secularist theory of national existence is false from the start. Just as truly as God made man so truly did He make the state; and just as truly as He calls men to him in relations of covenant responsibility with him, He does so with nations also. This secularist theory of the state is a thoroughly un-American theory, in spite of the loudness with which it has been proclaimed as being implied in our separation of the Church from the state, and our perfect freedom of religious convictions and worship. It is also in defiance of American history, as any one may discover who will examine the declarations of our national authorities on the subject, from

the Fast day and Thanksgiving proclamations of the Continental Congress and the general orders of George Washington down to our own time. The only notable utterances to the contrary are found in the treaty negotiated by a deist with a Moslem state, and in Thomas Jefferson's refusal to appoint a day of national thanksgiving and fasting. This one-sided theory of the state is in defiance also of the declarations of those state constitutions under which by far the greater part of the American people live. It is in defiance of the decisions of the national and state courts, which declare in substance that a tolerant christianity is imbedded in the public policy of the country and that whatever antagonizes christianity is illegal. It is in defiance of the solemn acts by which the national and the state authorities have invited the people of the land to return thanks to God for His goodness, or to deprecate the severity of His judgments by fasting and prayer. It is in contradiction of the public policy, which provides for the religious instruction of the soldiers of our armies and the sailors of our navy, for that of the dependent classes in public asylums, and for that of convicts in our prisons. It is contradicted by the action, not only of Congress and the state legislatures, but also the great political conventions, in inviting ministers of religion to open their sessions by invoking the blessings of Almighty God. Neither can it be brought into harmony with the practice of our courts, which make the rendering of a verdict and the giving of evidence an act of worship, by requiring of witness and juryman an oath "in the presence of Almighty God, the searcher of all hearts." In whatever direction we turn we find the American repudiation of this idea that the knowledge, the service and the kingdom of God are to be entirely divorced from all other provinces as outlying and separate provinces apart from God and entirely secular and profane. Certainly many people within our borders need a revival of a sense of universalism that will prevent them from looking upon knowledge as something restricted and foreign to religion. That they are not thus to be divorced is doubtless a divine ordination for guiding us to sound results. The plain and unmistakable historical fact is this, that

out of the Church and its teachings have issued successively all the other organizations of society, systems of constitutional government, education, art, the festivals and jubilees of social intercourse. The Church begot them all and for a long time they remained under its tutelage. It is not surprising considering our antecedents that the older, the more settled and conservative, the more thoroughly American any part of our great country becomes the more numerous are the evidences that the wise separation of the Church from the state means no sanction for the sundering of the state from God in the educational and other factors of our well being.

But aside from the historical aspect of the subject, the question arises as to the safety of this secular divorce of popular education from religion. That a system of public instruction is indispensable to the welfare of every nation, and in an eminent sense to ours, is a fact undisputed, but the question is as to the safety of this instruction when moral and religious instruction is separated from a wholesome and wisely adapted intellectual training. May not the mere Lord Brougham "schoolmaster" be ever so "much abroad among the people" and yet do them about as much harm as good? Is it not one of the most monstrous of solecisms that the popular education of an alleged christian nation should be organized—if not with an atheistic forgetfulness that there is a God, yet—with such a studied avoidance of about everything that is distinctively christian as to mean about the same thing? If there are dangers we shall surely neither diminish or avoid them by shutting our eyes to the facts or stigmatize the full and frank statement of them as the croaking notes of pessimistic alarmists who despair of the republic. None of us have any right to feel that there is anything in the human nature of the twentieth century, or any peculiar charm in the frame of our government that can insure us against the fate that has fallen upon other nations which in theory or practice have nullified the laws of right training or living.

Prof. George Frederick Wright, of Oberlin College, whom many of us reverence, both because of his scientific attainments and his christian character, has been writing recently on "The

Scientific Bases of Religion." His concluding sentence is of interest here :

"The facts of Christianity are as worthy of being taught as any other historical facts are. Indeed, no other facts of past history are so well substantiated by so great a variety of evidence as are those pertaining to the nature, the life and the work of Jesus Christ. We shall be in leed in a strange condition if we teach nothing in our schools but what the individual can 'demonstrate and verify.' Ninety-nine one-hundredths of what every one believes he receives on authority. We believe the theories of astronomy because expert mathematicians and observers tell us that they believe them. How does an Eastern investor learn that it is safe for him to invest in a mine in the Rocky Mountains or Alaska? It does not take long reflection to see that for the most of our practical knowledge we depend on 'expert testimony.' Such witness we have in that of the apostles and the early Church, who were the contemporaries of Christ, and who preserved their faith in the face of every possible opposition; and their testimony has been supported by the results."

In the New York *Sun* of December 7th, last, Principal Campbell, of the Wentworth School of Chicago, said: "We are bringing up all over this broad land a lusty set of young pagans, who, sooner or later, they or their children, will make havoc of our institutions." It was that sturdy Presbyterian scholar of great endowments and equally great attainments, the late Dr. A. A. Hodge, who bore this testimony :

"Every intelligent Protestant ought to know by this time, in the light of the terrible Socialistic revolutions which are threatened, that the danger to our country in this age is infinitely more from skepticism than from superstition." "In view of the entire situation, shall we not all of us who really believe in God give thanks to him that he has preserved the Roman Catholic Church in America to-day true to that theory of education upon which our fathers founded the public schools, and from which they have been so madly perverted?" "The system of public schools must be held, in their sphere, true to the claims

of Christianity, or they must go, with all other enemies of Christ, to the wall."

Bishop Johnson (Protestant Episcopal), of Texas, writes of "the trying days to come, when we are threatened with the overthrow of all we hold dearest, because of the influence of a godless education upon the rising generation."

President Stryker, of Hamilton College, in his inaugural address of January 17th, 1893, used these words: "Profoundly I believe that society must either become Christian or must collapse." But the question recurs, when will society become Christian while the schools "ignore all religion?" Mr. Bourke Cochran, of New York, is a Catholic, and in the debate recently conducted between him and President Schurman, of Cornell, the sympathies of the writer were largely with the latter. But aside from the conclusions drawn who will doubt the correctness of Mr. Cochran's premises in statements such as these, that the public schools are not Christian, because they ignore religious teachings. "Agnosticism," said he, "doesn't deny God, but ignores him. That is what we are doing in our public schools. Ignorance of God is the very basis of agnosticism." "I have no enmity for the public schools, said he, but object only as to the manner in which education is imparted. Every page in the history for 1900 years attests the progress of the world under Christianity. Shall public opinion in this country be Christian or agnostic? Shall the state expect the triumph of Christianity or will it continue to penalize it? That is the question. Shall the state dam up the fountain from which the moral law has sprung?"

These men are not unpatriotic, nor are they pessimistic, but representing various schools of Christian thinking, they all seem to have reached the same conclusion based upon a wide induction into the facts, viz., that an education without religion imperils things that we cherish most ardently and hold most dear as our inheritance from the wisdom, devotion and foresight of our fathers.

Japan has unquestionably gained much in the way of national progress by joining hands with Western nations, but somehow

she has not gained much in her moral character. The old religions had to a large extent become discredited and exerted but little moral influence. At the "Restoration" the government had recourse to Shintoism to improve the moral condition of the country, but Shinto could do nothing. Lessons in patriotism and loyalty, unaccompanied by a strong sense of individual responsibility for commercial probity and personal purity, had a baneful effect upon the people. Education advanced but morality declined, until in 1890, the Emperor, alarmed by the low moral condition of the schools, issued a rescript on the subject of education in which he laid stress upon the necessity of ethical training; but the effort made to encourage morality without religion was not encouraging. Dr. Seely, of the State Normal School of New Jersey, has recently paid his tribute to the German system of education. He said:—"The Germans hold that morality cannot be taught apart from dogmatic religious instruction. Religion is accepted as the corner-stone of German pedagogy, and more time is given to it in the curriculum than to any other subject.

"What is the result of this religious instruction, especially that of the great mass of children? After living with the German people for years, and carefully studying them, in spite of evils that certainly exist among them, there is love of home, respect for and obedience to law, honesty and integrity, diligence in business, conscientious regard for duty, practice of the Golden Rule, freedom from municipal and national corruption, love of country, belief in God, soundness of faith by the masses as a whole and the practice of righteousness."

Thus, despite the serious defects of a state church and the spread of rationalism and religious indifference in seats of learning and in the greater cities, it must be said that no such divorce between education and religion as has been permitted to come about in this country has thus far been possible in either Germany or Scandinavia. In our generation we shall not likely encounter a more sturdy unbeliever than the late Prot. Thomas Huxley, but it was Huxley who said: "I have been seriously perplexed to know by what practical measures

the religious feeling, which is the essential basis of conduct, was to be kept up, in the present utterly chaotic state of opinion without the use of the Bible."

"I hold," says he, "that any system of education which attempts to deal only with the intellectual side of a child's nature, and leaves the rest untouched, will prove a delusion and a snare, just as likely to produce a crop of unusually astute scoundrels as anything else. In my belief, unless a child be taught not only morality, but religion, education will come to very little."

It would seem then that our conception of religion will be in accordance with our conception of life. If a man looks upon the acquisition of things as the matter of supreme interest he will no doubt think of education in narrowly utilitarian terms. To such an one it will mean the learning of a trade, the mastering of manual and mental tools, the acquisition of such facts and the cultivation of such habits as will enable one to utilize nature's resources and get the better of one's fellow-men. On the other hand the man who thinks of life in ethical terms will think of education in ethical terms also. To him as has been said "the most practical education is that which imparts the most numerous and the strongest motives to noble action." The man who thinks of religion as every man ought to think, as the thing that stands first in the files of the world's passionate wishes and equally of its most strenuous endeavors, is not likely to contemplate education as dissociated from this factor. In such a view education becomes a means of introducing young life to its proper place in the social organism. If a man's spiritual capacities are his supreme endowment, as is almost uniformly admitted, then the unquestioned subordination of the moral and spiritual to the intellectual in all plans for the training of our youth needs to be reversed unless our aim be merely the training of the "clever" man, the "smart" man of the club, the street and the market place. "Thus," says Carlyle, "like some wild-flaming, wild-thundering train of heaven's artillery, does this mysterious mankind thunder and flame in long drawn, quick-succeeding grandeur through the unknown deep. Thus like a God created, fire-breathing spirit

host, we emerge from the inane, haste stormfully across the astonished earth, then plunge again into the inane." If this theory of rushing forth from nothing back into nothing be the true theory of man, then the purely secular theory of education may have some basis. In that event the business of the schoolmaster is merely this, to prepare a man to make this stormful haste across the astonished earth in the most becoming manner. If a man, like Carlyle's hero, is to walk wearisomely through this present world, having lost all tidings of another and higher, to the inane, the geography and topography of which are of course unknown, then it is grim mockery to contemplate education in other than in its strictly utilitarian aspects.

But man is a unity, as we have learned. Hence it follows that the neglect to give any factor its due attention must result in distortion. Education in a word must be symmetrical. Its supreme end is to make a man, not merely to make him physically strong, not merely intellectually well disciplined and well furnished, not merely sensitive in his spiritual relations, responding quickly and accurately to the claims of duty to self, to fellow-men and to God, but rather a man fully rounded and well balanced, physically, mentally and spiritually ready for action in any department of human life for which he may have individual aptitude and for which he may specifically furnish himself. Recent discussions of the educational problems before us as a people and movements that contemplate better organization along such lines of work, furnish us with a notable recognition of the fact that there is this inseparable unity in man's endowments, and that the neglect of any essential element of his constitution, and especially of the supreme element in any scheme of educational development, will surely avenge itself sooner or later upon the individual, the community or the commonwealth guilty of such neglect.

The neglect of the religious factor in our popular education looked at from another standpoint also carries its own admonition. From time to time our newspapers startle us with such headlines as "A reign of lawlessness," or "A saturnalia of crime." We are indeed moved, especially if our house has been

robbed or we have been waylaid in a populous and presumably well guarded city. But alas! these conditions are not peculiar to the community which we honor by our residence and suffrage, and which we may even complacently think to be so badly governed by a political party other than our own. These conditions are national, ominous and terrifying. The serious increase of crime in this country is something that ought to arrest the attention of every good citizen, and one that should be kept constantly before us until there is a turn in the tide, which may not yet be reached for years. One cause certainly is the lack of distinctively moral and religious teaching. There has been a great amount of emotional teaching in recent years; but there is a very different attitude to fundamental moral questions. Mr. S. S. McClure, a man courageously committed to the welfare of his country, published recently in his magazine a statistical synopsis on "The increase of lawlessness in the United States." In brief, we Americans are law-breakers in the following extent and ways:

In 1881 we killed one another unlawfully at the rate of one person in each 40,534 of population. In 1902 there was a murder or homicide to each 8,955. Between 1881 and 1903 we violently took the lives of our fellow Americans to the number of 129,464; but had we continued during this period relatively as self-restrained as we were in 1881 we should have killed but 35,109. So, for causes that the humblest and the mightiest of our people should take under instant and prayerful consideration, our homicidal activity has increased in twenty-three years at a rate represented by the difference between 112 and 24.7, the former being the number of murders and homicides for each million of people in 1903 and the latter the number of these crimes to each million in 1881. Within this same period the total number of suicides has increased from 605 to 8,597; and whereas corresponding with the 1,266 murders and homicides of 1881 there were ninety hangings, there were corresponding with the 8,876 capital crimes of 1903 but 124 hangings. So much for the volume of crime. Now for its classes. Between 1894 and 1900, both inclusive, and it is

to be noted that crime rises in hard times, there was a total of 68,812 murders and homicides, nearly one half being the result of quarrels. Causes behind 17,120 other cases are classified as unknown, but the remaining classifications are as follows: Jealousy, 3,313; liquor, 2,845; by highwaymen, 2,310; infanticide, 1,819; resisting arrest, 1,096; highwaymen killed, 841; strikers, 365; self defense, 440; rage, 188; riots, 152; insanity, 827.

There must be some far reaching cause that this shame of crime lies thus heavily upon us. The fact that we are killing more people in three years than the British army lost in the Boer War is a fact too ugly to be looked in the face with complacency. The feeling is coming over the country that something must be done about it; that there should be less hanging of juries and more hanging of murderers; that higher courts should see something more than loop-holes for bad men to get through; and that the public should look somewhat into the moral training of the young.

The high record was reached in 1896, when there were 10,654 murders and homicides in a population of 70,000,000. In 1899, conditions improved some, but since then they have steadily grown worse. This is worse than war, worse than railroad accidents and their dreadful slaughter, worse than yellow fever or the plagues of the tropics. In Paris during the year 1903, there were fifteen murders or attempted murders. In the city of Chicago during the same period there were eight times as many murders as in Paris, and, with less than one third of the population and area covered by the London police, six times as many murders as in that great city.

When we seek for the primary causes, the fundamental sources of this doleful stream of lawlessness, it is always rather confidently suggested that much of it is traceable to our foreign born population. But there is no palliation for the native, hereditary, constitutional American here. In 1900, we had a foreign born population of 10,356,644. Excepting 426,096 from Russia—and in Europe, these were victims rather than aggressors—all these people came from countries having not

half as many murders and homicides as there are in the United States. True Americans therefore, men who have received what training they possess in this country, are the leaders of native and immigrant in defying and breaking our own laws. Granting then that we are, as alas! it must be said, a law breaking people what are the social and political conditions that make thus for the practice and tolerance of crime, petty and great? Certain forces that menace popular government, certain sources of corruption and the non-enforcement of law in city, state and nation have been adduced. They are represented, and no doubt rightly, as habitually condoning, fostering and flagrantly committing lawlessness. But does the training received in our public schools, from which all that is distinctively religious and ethical is so rigidly excluded in many cases, have no share of the blame for this deplorable exhibit? Not so, think those who have made investigation. The examination of the public schools in various parts of the country which Miss Marie Shaw has been conducting for the *World's Work*, was ended in the November last number of that magazine with her general conclusions under the title "How successful are the public schools." After speaking of the meagre results physically and the mental showing hardly less meagre, she says: "Morally, the school showing is poorer still. There are, of course, in great cities, many influences that suggest the getting of money without work. The schools do not counteract these influences as they might."

Writing in the *Independent* of December 31st, 1903, President Hadley, of Yale, says: "Few of us who have looked into the statistics of education and crime are optimistic enough to deny that they are quite disappointing." * * * I confess that I share some of the apprehensions of these advocates of Church schools; but I am far from agreeing with them as to the proper remedy."

Certainly we have adduced enough to show that the contradiction between the religious and secular view of life is fundamental and irreconcilable. It may be possible, as some who are specialists on the subject advocate, to divide the labor of

teaching between the family, the church and the state, and to assign to each some functions that are not assumed by the others, but it should always be remembered that the child is one and indivisible, and refuses to be thus classified and divided. The whole of him is present in the state school and that for a large proportion of the time in the most formative period of life. There, as well as in the church and the home, he is forming his notion and his attitude with respect to the problems of life, responsibility and law.

It was considerations such as I have adduced that led Stubbs, the author of the "Constitutional History," to say: "The Church cannot engross the work of education without some danger to liberty; the state cannot engross it without some danger to religion; the work of the Church without liberty loses half of its value; the state without religion does only half its work." That is, religion has to do with instruction on its ethical side, and on that side she ought to speak with authority, while recognizing that there is another on which the qualified and equipped pedagogue has a right to speak with authority also.

We believe that the church and state ought to be separated as they are in this country, and as they should be throughout Europe. But the state depends in the last analysis largely upon religion to aid her in keeping the people in proper relation to the state and to each other. Suppose that the state says, you shall not kill because it is not right? But who says it is not right? says the boy. God says so. But where? In the Bible. Oh, but says some secularistic iconoclast, that is teaching religion. But the question is, ought not the state to teach religion sufficiently to teach her subjects that the laws have their foundation in the divine mind, and are not simply police expedients devised by the state? The home and the church have each their proper sphere for the teaching of religion. But the state can never depend with safety upon either the home or the church for the training of her subjects in whatever is essential for her own well being. President Eliot, of Harvard, is right in saying this that is fundamental: "Nobody

knows how to teach morality effectually without religion. Exclude religion from education and you will leave no foundation on which to build a moral character."

In our country it is peculiarly necessary to counteract the overgrowth and dangerous tendencies of the commercial and political spirit. The overgrowth of these and other dangerous influences in other countries may be checked somewhat, not only by venerable institutions both of religion and learning, but also by ancient dignities, more imposing forms of government and various other causes which have no place in this country. The only counteracting influences that can be brought to bear in this country are to be found in religion and mental training, and religion left as it is to take care of itself, will be entirely inadequate unless the intellectual spirit of the nation be elevated by an alliance with it. The freest government is the one exposed to the greatest perils. If it works not well it must work worse than others. Our form of government presupposes that the capacity of self-government is commensurate with the right and consequently it is fit for us no longer than we are fit for it. Universal suffrage in the hands of an unenlightened and corrupt people is like a deadly weapon in the hands of a mad-man. You can give the people the right of ruling only on the supposition that they have the goodness to rule well. The enactments of a majority will never be a whit wiser or better than the wisdom and virtue of the individuals that compose that majority. It is coming to be an increasingly grave question whether the people of this country have not already shared in a one-sided political education in a false and overweening sense of liberty, by which multitudes in our borders mean simply this, the doing by every man of that which is pleasing in his own eyes. All of this and more makes it of fundamental importance in a country intensely democratic, and where religion has no fixed and settled institutions, but is left with other things, to the determination of the popular will, that its voice shall be heard in the direction of the intellectual energies of the people.

Education alone will not transform a young Slav into a true

American but religion with education has done it effectually. A successful democracy demands that the rulers, *i. e.*, the people, shall be intelligent, but it also requires that they be good.

The question now recurs as to what provision is made for this higher factor in popular training and what tendencies are beginning to manifest themselves in this matter of such vital concern? I have not been able to examine the courses of study of many normal schools, nor many of the examination papers set for applicants for teachers' certificates, but my information is that at present training in morals of the higher order is nowhere recognized as a part of a teacher's preparation. That the teacher is expected to be of good moral character, and that he is so almost uniformly goes without saying: that our public school teachers are recruited from the ranks of the very best Christian people in the community, and whose personal influence is almost uniformly of a good order is a most agreeable fact. But this also is a fact that the possession of personal morality no more qualifies for teaching morality, than does the fact that I personally—so far as anybody knows—possess a perfect outfit of bones, muscles, arteries, veins, lungs, stomach, liver and all the rest of a complete anatomical equipment, qualify me to be a demonstrator in anatomy in a first class medical college. Certain it is that formal text books in morals have never been successful in schools in this country. The instruction must come all from the lips of the teacher, and that is all the more the reason that we should see to it that the teacher is given a fair chance at the hands of the boards of school management. Direct religious exercises in public schools seldom go further than the reading of the Bible. In most of the States of the Union the law gives no authority, as a matter of right, to use any portion of the regular school hours in conducting any religious exercises, at which the attendance of pupils is required. In many cities of the country any sort of religious exercises is forbidden. In Iowa for example the matter is left entirely at the judgment of the teacher. Washington prohibits the reading of the Bible in the schools, while in Arizona they revoke the certificate of any teacher who con-

ducts any sort of religious exercises in school. In 1890 the Supreme Court of Wisconsin decided the reading of the Bible in the public schools to be unconstitutional. In 1869 the Cincinnati School Board was upheld in forbidding the reading of the Bible. The same action was taken in Chicago in 1875, and in New Haven in 1878. The law on the subject ranges between absolute prohibition of Bible reading; permitting it when no one objects but not otherwise; leaving it to the opinion of the local authorities, either trustees or teacher; and requiring it, either leaving the amount and method to the teacher or prescribing a very limited amount of reading daily. At the best this is not much, not much of the Bible, and almost nothing in the way of effective teaching. If there is not more direct religious teaching in our schools, at least it is not the fault of the teachers, nor can there be more than there is now unless the laws are changed.

It may be recalled that President Eliot in a well known address made a somewhat sweeping arraignment of the public schools because of the great prevalence of drunkenness, gambling, rioting, misgovernment and almost every form of vice and crime. However much we resent the arraignment we must all feel and know that in some way the public school has not touched and quickened the heart and conscience of the nation as we had hoped it would do. Is it not possible that in our progress and prosperity we are forgetting the God of our fathers? In discussing the great anthracite coal strike President Roosevelt said in substance: we do not need a new philosophy to solve this problem; we only need to put into practice the well known and oft tried precepts of the Bible, the doctrine of the Golden Rule. And so our people are realizing more and more that the practice of Christian virtues is the one thing most needful in the solution of our most perplexing problems, social, commercial, political, public and private. Men and women everywhere are looking about, endeavoring to find a better way to develop a higher type of manhood, how to disseminate and perpetuate the nobler Christian virtues. And so we are asking the government, if it cannot do more. We are

asking the same thing of the home and of the Church, whether through all its varied agencies it cannot do more to make men morally better. Have we not a right, also to ask of the school, the youngest child of democracy, whether it too cannot do more? vastly more considering the possibilities before it, to promote the religious and moral education of the people.

At the time that the lamented President McKinley was murdered at Buffalo, and when this great country, bowed in a common sorrow over the pathetic and untimely end of the life of that noble man, was holding memorial services throughout all our borders, I saw the program prepared for such a service under authority, by the superintendent of public instruction in Chicago. It recounted the birth and stations filled in succession by Mr. McKinley. It spoke of his devotion as a son and husband. It recounted the unexpected villiany at Buffalo. It recited about how that the assassin's regicidal act had failed of its end because the vice-president in due process of law, and quietly, became the head of the nation. Not one word however was discernable about the real basis of such a life of transparent excellence as that lived by the lamented and much loved president. And all this in the face of a fact as luminous as the sun that a man of McKinley's order cannot be accounted for by any analysis that leaves out a big estimate of the religious factor. Such men are not grown in an atmosphere other than that in which as babe, boy and young man, Mr. McKinley lived and passed from one stage of his splendid career to another until, crowned with the respect and affection of this great people, he had passed beyond.

It is to be feared that this studious and almost grotesque avoidance of the religious factor, is characteristic, and in some cases enforced. In such performances the schools are certainly not doing their share in developing a regal manhood for the coming days. It has been urged, with Pretorious, that fear first made the gods, and, with Fenerbach, that religion is man's most terrible ailment. It would seem to be otherwise in Chscago, where at least prompt and radical precautions are taken by the school board against its spread.

It would be interesting to see in detail what the other great civilized nations are doing in this matter of moral and religious training in the public schools. In England there has been established a system of religious instruction, denominational in the church schools, and undenominational in the public schools, which reaches almost every child in the land. In France, we find a country predominantly Roman Catholic in confession, although both Protestant and Jewish religions enjoy state support. In a country in which all large religious bodies are subsidized by the state, it would seem to be natural and easy to have a regular system of religious instruction in connection with the day schools. This, however, is not the fact, and no religious instruction whatever is given in connection with the public schools. The history and moral standards of this people would hardly commend their system as the ideal one in pedagogics. Turning now to Germany we find that very much of serious religious instruction is imparted in the day schools and predominantly by the regular teachers employed for secular instruction. Probably in no country in the world is the religious instruction so systematically and thoroughly given as in that country. The principal function of the German school is officially declared to be the making of God fearing, patriotic, self-supporting citizens. The Germans would no more think that religion could be omitted from the program of instruction than that mathematics or languages could be left out. Every teacher in that country receives religious training for his work, although not every teacher gives religious instruction in the schools. A comparison with the time given to religious training in Germany and several other countries of Europe shows that our own country is far behind the demands of the case and serves to reveal the gravity of the situation. In discussing this point in the December last issue of the *Heidelberg Teacher*, a Reform magazine for teachers and Bible classes, the editor, Dr. Rufus W. Miller, says:—

“In Germany four or five hours per week are given to religious instruction in the public schools. The first places on the curricula are taken by this subject. The first hour in the

morning is given to religious instruction. In addition, one afternoon each week the pupils meet for religious studies, usually in the church, but in many instances in the school building. For some time before confirmation they meet two or three times a week. Many in Germany consider the amount of religious instruction to be too small.

"In France no religious instruction is given in the public schools. Thursday is set apart by the law as a holiday and the denominations provide religious instruction on this day. In the Reformed churches the sessions are usually an hour and a half long. When the lesson on Thursday is in the Old Testament, then the lesson on the Sabbath is in the New Testament, and vice versa.

"In England opportunity for religious instruction is given in the week-day schools. And most churches on the Sabbath have two sessions of the Sabbath-school."

Such facts adduced, not by a foreigner, but by a patriotic American Christian teacher, ought at least to quicken reflection among us. The writer from whom I have just quoted goes even further and asks this question: "Why should not the public schools omit the Wednesday afternoon sessions and allow the churches to take that time for religious instruction, each denomination seeing after their own children and as many other children as can be reached?"

It may be alleged that while the suggestion is a good one, it would be found difficult of accomplishment in this country as it seems to be impracticable even in France. But the mere fact that the question is raised indicates the unsatisfactory situation at present, and the demand alike of Christianity and patriotism that something be done, ere both state and church suffer incalculable harm.

Of all the elements that go to make a country great and strong, none is quite so essential as conscience. Men must trust one another if they are to get on well in the relations of trade. Commerce without conscience is impossible. In the last analysis every business house, every banking institution, every manufacturing enterprise owes its existence and stability

to conscience. Conscience counts in the matter of dollars and cents. It is really the ligament that binds society together; and without it all our social and political institutions would go to pieces. Archbishop Ireland is neither a fanatic or an alarmist, but on the contrary a well-poised, level headed, far-seeing man, and this is what he said in an address to the business men of Cleveland some five or six years ago: "Take away conscience on election day, let voters, like the populace of old Rome, scramble for food and pleasure, and democracy will have given up the ghost and either an imperator will trample upon American liberties, or anarchy will fill the land with lurid flames." The words of the great prelate are not too extravagant, for the thing that makes our property, our liberties and our homes secure is conscience, the feeling ingrained into the hearts of the people that right is right, and wrong is wrong, and that somewhere, sometime and somehow, men will have to answer for their conduct at a bar where justice cannot be bought and the judge cannot be bribed.

After all our eulogies have been spoken and our applause for our system has died away, the fact remains that the instruction given and the influences emanating from our public schools are intensely secular. However humanizing and useful their work, they do not make the training of the conscience and the kindling of the moral sense prominent enough for safety. The instruction does not touch the deep places of the moral nature. On these important lines it is too weak and colorless to command the will and turn the life currents upward.

To teach ethics without the enforcement of divine sanctions has about as much power to purify and ennoble character, as paint on the pump has a purifying influence on the well. Leave the masses to the leadership of unprincipled agitators, of unscrupulous office-seekers, of doctrinaire social reformers, of arragant walking delegates, and it is a little painful to think about what the outcome will inevitably be. Unless they are led by men with quickened consciences as well as trained heads the present unrest will go on to issues which it is not pleasant to contemplate. It cannot cease to be deplored by all right

minded people that in this matter of popular education, we have receded also from our own original ideals.

When the public school was first established in this country, and for a century and a half afterwards, definite religious instruction was an important part of the school curriculum. The fathers and founders of the various commonwealths believed in the public school because they believed as they declared that instruction in " religion and morality, and knowledge was necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind." To-day specific religious instruction is practically banished from every public school in the land. As to the provision in the Constitution, in virtue of which the American people are supposed to be irrevocably pledged to neutrality in this matter, any body with half an eye can see that the neutrality so pledged was as between the various religious sects, and not at all between religion and irreligion. It should not be forgotten that the men who made the Constitution were making a constitution, not for a people who had no religion or who were averse to religion or who needed legislation on the subject, but for a people who were very religious, and whose ideals were not those of the Moslem or of the French commune. The convention left religion out of the Constitution, not that it might be trampled under foot of men, but in the belief that in leaving the whole subject of religion to the governments of the several commonwealths composing the confederation, its ultimate prevalence would best be promoted.

The makers of the Constitution never dreamed of being neutral, and had there been the slightest suspicion on the part of the people that Christianity was being repudiated, the infant nation would no doubt have never been federated. The commonwealths entering into that federation had all been planted upon a distinctively Christian basis. The Pilgrims and Puritans who made the early settlements in New England, the Germans, Swedes and Quakers who came to Pennsylvania and Delaware, the Dutch who settled the valley of the Hudson, the Cavaliers in Virginia, and the Catholics in Maryland, were all ardent believers in the Christian religion. Chief Justice Kent,

in rendering a decision in the case of a man indicted for aspersing the character of our Lord, ruled that the people of this country profess the general doctrines of Christianity for the rule of faith and practice, and that to scandalize the teacher of these doctrines is a gross violation of decency and good order. Daniel Webster has said: "There is nothing more certain than that Christianity is part of the law of the land-general, tolerant Christianity, independent of sects and parties," while Justice Story has said: "One of the beautiful traits of our jurisprudence is that Christianity is part of the common law from which it seeks the sanction of its rights, and by which it endeavors to regulate its doctrine." Such has been the practical construction of American constitutions with few exceptions during the entire period of our history. Many such acknowledgements led Mr. Justice Brewer, of the present supreme court, to say: "There is no dissonance in these declarations. There is a universal language pervading them all, having one meaning; they affirm and reaffirm that this is a religious nation." Again: "If we pass beyond these matters to a view of American life as expressed by its laws, its business, its customs and its activity, we find everywhere a clear recognition of the same truth." Then referring to oaths, etc., he says: "These and many other matters which might be noticed, add a volume of unofficial declarations to the mass of organic utterances that this is a Christian nation." That the representatives of commonwealths sharing in such pronounced Christian antecedents, when they come together to weld those several commonwealths into a greater and combined commonwealth, should have entirely divested themselves of their most sacred beliefs and turned traitors to their religion, is something incredible in American character and history.

Certain old vanquished heresies pertaining to this subject still limp about the field of controversy. They have been made to do service for a generation or more. Dead they are, in every intelligent court of appeal, but revamped into life from time to time, they are led forth to bolster up what we have found

to be unsound in pedagogics and dangerous to the public well being.

There is, for example, the old plea that the teaching of religion in the schools of the country is an invasion of the rights of that part of the community which wants no sort of religion at all, and is particularly insistent upon the divorce between religion and education for other people. In reply to this specious plea, it might be said that there is no adequate reason that can be assigned why the rights of society, in its corporate aspects, should be subordinated to the rights of any individual, even though that individual may feel called upon to suffer martyrdom, in his own mind, for conscience sake. In securing to every individual his constitutional rights, the state does not contemplate the whims and caprices of every man, woman and child, balanced and unbalanced, within its borders, nor pledge itself to respect all the peculiar beliefs and disbeliefs of Jew and Moslem, Mormon and agnostic, anarchist and socialist, infidel and atheist, and order the state's education according to the standards of paganism and superstition.

Another objection that has been answered a hundred times, but is nevertheless yet used in behalf of the secularist propaganda, is this, that the teaching of any sort of religion in state schools necessitates sectarian education. To this it might be replied that the Bible is not a denominational book, nor would anybody, excepting a Romanist, contemplate any such use of it. The great outlying data in Biblical ethics constitute something that is unmixed with contention.

The objection to the multiplicity and the differences of the sects is the old vanquished, secular infidel, story—the argument of prejudice and misinformation. There are certain grand, basic principles and certain great religious truths which are amply supported by a consensus of all the creeds. The existence and rulership of God, the immortality of the soul, the brotherhood of man, the fact of sin and responsibility for conduct in this world—these and kindred truths are fundamental, they mount up above all controversy and stand upon the basis of universal acknowledgement.

There can be no wide difference of opinion about the truth that the virtues required in the law of Moses and commended in the beatitudes of our blessed Lord are good and wholesome principles to live by whether a man be a Jew, a Catholic, a Protestant, and that a lie is a lie, whether it be told, practiced, or enacted at Jerusalem, in the Vatican or on Wall Street. This is one only of the great outlying facts of biblical ethics. Every man, be he Catholic, Jew or Protestant, or even informed and fair-minded agnostic knows that the dangers which threaten, lie not in the region of sectarian antipathy and rancor but rather in that of avowed and dangerous secularism and hostile unbelief.

Since the earlier part of this paper was written there has come to the writer's table Prof. Coe's latest book on educational themes, and he is glad to adduce here in proof of the foregoing what that able writer has to say on the subject in hand. "Religion or irreligion," says he, "is present in the schools just as surely as teachers are present. The notion that the state school can be strictly neutral with respect to the great problem of life and destiny is simply illusory; it has no basis in psychology or in the principles of education. It is incumbent upon us therefore to take one side or the other, either the religious or the secularist, and then—not by any insincerity or indirection, but frankly—let our actual principle be incorporated into the state school." Such truths need to be dinned into the ears of our people until they shall refuse to be reconciled to this perilous banishment of religion from our common schools which were founded upon a basis that promised great good to our cherished country. Knowledge after all is a weapon that may be used by a saint or by a rogue. Reading, writing, and arithmetic, ability to interpret the laws of nature that govern the life of the tiniest animaculæ as well as the sweep of the great planets on the outskirts of space, all these are good and desirable, but they are safe possessions only as they are inspired by sound religious and ethical principles. A boy who has mastered the secular curriculum of our schools may be armed, but the question is whether he is so full panoplied as not to be vul-

nerable at some most vital points? And in the discussion of this and associated problems we should keep our eyes steadfastly upon the vital connection between religion and morality. A forcible writer in a recent newspaper article has expressed it finely: "There can be no true religion without a lofty morality, and no more can there be a lofty morality without religion. there can be manners without religion; but manners such as cleanliness and courtesy are a matter of soap and sandpaper. The difference between manners and morals is as wide as the difference between clean clothes and a clean heart. Morality is a spirit and a life. It is a living of the moral law. And what is the moral law? Moses wrote it in full in the decalogue, and Christ condensed it in the gospel—thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and soul, and mind, and strength, and thy neighbor as thyself."

Our national institutions have had no more sympathetic and intelligent critic and interpreter than Mr. James Bryce in "The American Commonwealth." Speaking in part six of that work of christianity, Mr. Bryce says of it that "though not the legally established religion, it is yet the national religion." And speaking of our people he says in the same connection, "They deem the general acceptance of Christianity to be one of the main sources of their national prosperity, and their nation a special object of the divine favor." All the other moral systems of the world excepting that begotten and fostered by the religion which Mr. Bryce declares to be ours have broken completely down. "There has never been a great moralist from Confucius to Seneca," says an authority on the subject, "who was able to reform the street on which he lived." Such being the case how do we propose to keep getting on well, and as well in the future as in the past, if we propose to take the beating heart out of an educational system planned to reach every boy and girl in the land? How do we propose to escape the destiny of all things godless, if we propose to go on making concessions to infidel and agnostic, and excluding that which we have found to be essential to national virtue and safety? This is what we have come to in the United States and

in France as regards religious training in education, that democracy has completely secularized the schools. The school therefore gives an incomplete education. The religious aspect of civilization and the place and influence of religion in the life of the individual are excluded from its view. This is the important fact to be reckoned with. We want no Romish policy to reinstate mediaevalism and teach dogmas and claims that are unhistorical and unscriptural, but the time has come when that secularism and infidelity which work disorganization and death should be resisted as the enemies of free government.

We need to ponder carefully the words of our versatile and noble President in his message to Congress in December, 1904. Mr. Roosevelt said: "If a race does not have plenty of children, or if the children do not grow up, or if when they grow up they are unhealthy in body and stunted or vicious in mind, then that race is decadent and no heaping up of wealth, no splendor of momentary material prosperity, can avail in any degree as offsets." And his other words spoken elsewhere: "Back of the material and greater than the material lie the moral and the spiritual."

Patriotism has a right to demand something of education. When Phillips Brooks preached his great Fourth of July sermon in Westminster Abbey, he said that the cry of one nation to another the world over was this, "Show us your man." That is the cry which ought to run as a challenge from every part of the working life of the nation to every other part, from industry to commerce, from commerce to education, from education to religion and back again. The man whom we would like to show we were in the business of educating, should not be a segment of a man, but a complete man. We shall not likely produce him, and produce him long, if we leave out of our system of pedagogics one of the most important and fundamental factors in the making of manhood.

The only reason why matters have not gone worse in some communities is that most of the teachers have maintained a strong sense of the sacredness of their high calling and have managed to keep up the standards and quickened impulses to

thought and righteousness, such as can come up from a living soul. This have they done, while other and able men, busy with questions of finance, have played the part of the shirk, while dolts and dullards sometimes have dictated educational policies. Speaking of this country the late Dr. Hastie, author of "The Theology of the Reformed Church in its fundamental principles," says: "It is not clear whether Protestantism or Romanism or utter secularism is yet to win in this unfenced field." Most Americans would feel obliged to dissent at least from the suggestion implied in the metaphor of the "unfenced field," but the more thoughtful among them would feel some reasonable apprehensions regarding the possibility of secularism.

If certain regretful tendencies that have gained widespread recognition in recent years, and which have induced us to recede from the higher educational ideals of a former time, are permitted to go on unchecked, we may expect an increase of that hard commercial and worldly spirit which is always and everywhere less heroic, less reverent, and less influenced by the enthusiasm of high spiritual ideals and unselfish interest. Whenever our land becomes a mere Sahara of secularism it will be as worthless as any other moral sandheap. May we not be drifting toward the inevitable day of disaster upon the rocks on the leeward side? If so shall we be able to cast out some of our secular impedimenta and wear off upon a safer tack? The answer may depend very much upon our attitude in the matter of the neglected factor in our popular education.

ARTICLE III.

ST. PAUL AS A WITNESS TO THE SUPERNATURAL.

BY PROFESSOR LUTHER A. FOX, D.D.

Religion is slowly growing in favor in philosophic circles. Epicurus, grieved by the religious fears of his mother, undertook to deliver the world from the slavery of superstition by undermining all religion. With the revival of Epicureanism it became fashionable to sneer at the Church, and science claimed as its special mission the emancipation of men from the bondage of the priests. Religion was decried and religious people were pitied or held in contempt. But scientific men are speaking more respectfully of religion, and philosophers like Paulsen are bold enough to claim for it a permanent place in human life. "Religion will never die out; it satisfies the innermost and deepest needs of the human soul."

This change in training is due to two things. The first is that religion is such a prominent fact in history that it refuses to be ignored. It must be accounted for in any complete explanation of the world. There was an attempt to minimize it by ascribing its beginning to natural causes, but it failed. Even if it did have its starting point, as Weber says, in the childish transformations of physical conditions into an enchanted world, *i. e.*, naturalism, or, as Spencer thought, in the dreams of the earliest barbarians and in the emanation of dead ancestors, *i. e.*, animism, it nevertheless must have had a deeper origin. It has survived the age of the humanity child and has grown stronger as well as clearer with advancing civilization. Men everywhere and always have been religious. The most enlightened as well as the lowest savages have had their objects of worship. The Aryan has long, long ago, ceased to deify the air, but he bows before the infinite God. Religion is one of the deepest instincts of our nature. We may define man as a religious animal. We can no more deny his religious than his rational nature. Every

philosophy of the world, under the penalty of incompleteness and consequent failure, must include religion.

The second reason for the more respectful training of scientific men towards religion is found in the strenuous efforts of many prominent ministers to accommodate doctrines to the latest scientific opinions. The claims of religion are lowered to make it more palatable to the scientific taste. Some of these Churchmen are vain and ambitious and want to be regarded as fully abreast with the most advanced thought. They are in a hurry to embrace its latest utterances and they greedily swallow the most recent statements. They forget that the newest is not always the truest, and that there is a difference between a hypothesis and established fact. Their vanity makes them traitors to the truth. Other Churchmen are moved by the more worthy desire of winning to the Church the men of science and philosophy. They pare the creeds and trim the Bible to make them more acceptable to those who deny inspiration and miracle. They admit that the earlier stories of the Old Testament may be mere legends and myths and are important only in the history of religious growth. They strip the New Testament of specific doctrines and miracles and leave us a mere skeleton of moral principles. They call justification by faith a theological fiction and profess to have outgrown the reformation. It is this denuded Christianity that scientific men profess to respect. It is certainly not the religion of the Church, and they make a wide distinction between Christianity and Theology. Dr. J. W. Draper wrote of the Conflict between Science and Religion, but Andrew D. White a few years later wrote of the Conflict between Science and Theology. We must not, therefore, attach too much importance to words like those of Paulsen, "Religion will not disappear from the world." "That is above all the grand teaching of Christianity; through suffering and death we pass to resurrection and glory."* That sounds well, but when we come to understand it we find it a mere husk.

*Introduction to Philosophy, pp., 326-335.

The Christianity which we received from our fathers and hold dearer than life is a supernatural religion. Bereft of its character as a revelation from God, its prime essence is gone. It is God's voice speaking through inspired men, not the utterance of mere religious genius. It is not a philosophy, but a divinely established religion. The man who does not believe this differs radically from us and we can not regard him a Christian. For him Jesus was only a wonderfully gifted teacher; for us he is God incarnate. We may seem to him benighted and superstitious, back numbers, or religious fossils or what not, but he seems to us a heathen. The question of the supernatural is the crucial one. The miraculous in the gospel story is the vital issue. The man who says that the miracles, once the corner stone of evidence, have become the stumbling block to educated people, ought to remain outside of the Church. He is not entitled in any true and historic sense to the name Christian. If the Church ever erases from her creed the article of the supernatural she degenerates into a mere charitable institution and becomes a mere ethical sect.

Natural science can have no place for the supernatural. It tells us that "we must always wait for sensible evidence for our beliefs and when such evidence is inaccessible we must frame no hypothesis whatever." It deals with physical facts under close and fast law. It must take facts as it finds them, and it is unscientific to inquire into the ultimate origin of things or the primary basis of law. We have no fault to find with La Place when as a mere scientist he said to Napoleon, "I have no need of the hypothesis of God," nor with Dr. Osler when he said to the Harvard students that science can know nothing of the immortality of man. Neither God nor the soul after death is a sensible fact. Mere science has no more place for consciousness than it has for God. One of the most fundamental principles is the conservation of energy. The physical energy of stimulus and nerve can not, under that law, be turned into conscious activity, nor the energy of consciousness into physical force. Consciousness lies just as much outside of natural science as the supernatural. Physiological psychology

has taught us much about the physical side of mental phenomena, but has thrown no light upon the nature of consciousness. It knows nothing of free will or moral ideals. Its judgments are of facts, not values. It can not furnish a solution of the problem of the world. It is entitled to no word about the supernatural. But its pretensions are astonishing. It is very young yet but it makes wonderful claims for itself. Dr. William James says, "Think how absolutely new scientific conceptions have arisen in our own generation, how many new problems have been formulated that were never thought of before, and then cast your eye upon the brevity of science's career. It began with Galileo not three centuries ago. Four thinkers since Galileo each informing his successor of what his own lifetime had achieved, might have passed the torch of science into our own hands as we sit here tonight in this room. Indeed for the matter of that an audience much smaller than the present one, an audience of some five or six score people, if each person in it could speak for his own generation, would carry us back to the black unknown of the human species, to days without a document or a monument to tell the tale. Is it credible that such a mushroom knowledge, such a growth overnight as this, can represent more than the smallest glimpse of what the universe will really prove to be when adequately understood? No! Our science is a drop, our ignorance a sea. Whatever else be certain this at least is certain, that the world of our present natural knowledge is enveloped in a larger world of some sort of whose residual properties we at present can frame no positive idea." * In that larger world of which this scientist and philosopher speaks there may be plenty of room for the supernatural. We should hear attentively all that science has to say in its various departments, use its methods as far as applicable in all investigations but not beyond them, *ne sutor supra crepidam*.

Philosophy is the science of reality, the sum total of all scientific knowledge. Its field is far wider than physics. Its prov-

*The Will to Believe, p. 53.

ince is the universe so far as it is known. It seeks to rationalize all knowledge and reduce all things to unity. It can never become complete until the universe has been thoroughly explored. Its present tendency is to monism in the form of absolute identity. Mind and matter are not substances but manifestations, modification of the eternal infinite substance. On its religious side this philosophy is pantheism. God is absorbed in or identical with the universe. Outside of and independent of the world he has no existence. The supernatural is, therefore, impossible. Paulsen is a spiritualistic monist and an avowed pantheist. Miracles for him are absurd. "The Biblical miracles are no exception to this rule; they belong to a category of world views which has disappeared and cannot long survive them. I do not believe that the Church can again win the confidence of thinking men until she decides to discard the belief in miracles." * He has no more place for the divine right of conscience than for the supernatural. "Conscience is the consciousness of custom." As long as philosophy is pantheistic it will regard the story of a miracle as a myth. But our philosophy is not final. The present systems can be regarded as little more than tentative. The numerous wrecks along the line of higher thought serve as warnings against our confidence. The memory of Hegelianism is recent enough to restrain the arrogance of even the most daring. Indeed philosophy is just now a little out of favor. The riddle of the world is not solved. A wiser philosophy may yet find that reality can be explained only by the hypothesis of a personal God. The day for the burial of the Christianity of our fathers has not yet been appointed. We may still ask what evidence do we have that God has revealed himself by supernatural means to sinful men? It remains a question of fact and not theory. What cannot be accounted for by any known natural force must be left wholly unexplained or be ascribed to the supernatural. We believe the case is stronger than that. We may safely assume that we know enough about natural laws to say

*System of Ethics, p. 435.

that some things connected with the Gospel story are either myths or miracles.

St. Paul for several different reasons becomes one of the most important witnesses to the fact of the supernatural. Next after our Lord he is the most conspicuous figure in the Church. Dr. Schaff calls him "the most remarkable and influential character in history." The main facts of his life are too clearly established to be questioned. He wrote nearly as much as all the other writers of the New Testament combined. Nearly all of his works are admitted by the great body of critical scholars to be genuine. Only a very few extreme radicals, like Bruno Bauer and Loman, have ventured to pronounce all of them fabrications. Tübingen recognized the first four, and since the time of F. C. Baur the list has grown until all except Ephesians and the pastoral epistles* are conceded. His preëminent ability is acknowledged. He was the first to recognize the universal side of our Lord's life and accept with full consciousness the meaning of the commission "Go into all the world." He carried out with clear purpose the tendency which had its beginning in Stephen and Barnabas and did most among the Apostles to make Christianity a universal religion. Without him the Church would have remained a much longer time under the trammels of the Jewish law and might have sunk back like the Ebionitic party into a Jewish sect. So important was the service he rendered that in onesided and extravagant language he has been called the author of Christianity. Bacon says, "Christianity as we know it is Pauline Christianity." His great talents, his rich experience, his exalted character and his magnificent work entitle him to the place we give him in Christian Evidence.

Though of the Diaspora Paul was a Jew of perfectly pure strain, a Hebrew of the Hebrews. He was a native of Tarsus and by inheritance a Roman citizen. His father was a Pharisee and though very devoted to the religion of his fathers was politically more liberal than most of his brethren. The family

*These are rapidly gaining favor.

had some prominence in the community. "In the first century when the citizenship was still jealously guarded, the *civitas* may be taken as a proof that the family was of distinction and at least of moderate wealth."* His early life was passed in a Jewish home located in a Gentile community, and he was, therefore, under both Jewish and Gentile influences.

Tarsus was a commercial, political and educational centre. It was the seat of one of the three great universities of the Roman world. The celebrated Athenodorus, the friend of Seneca, was about this time one of the philosophical faculty. Ramsay thinks that Paul was more influenced by this ministry than is commonly supposed. The boy breathed its literary atmosphere, even though he was not a student in its halls, and must have been to some extent at least affected by it. Possibly it is through Athenodorus the likeness between Paul and Seneca may be best explained. But the first school to which little Saul was sent was most probably the one in connection with the synagogue. If the educational rule, "At thirteen let them be subject to the law," was at that time in force, he was sent at that age to Jerusalem to be brought up at the feet of Gamaliel. Here he studied the Old Testament with eminent success. He became equally familiar with the Hebrew and the Greek text. He learned the methods of interpretation that were popular at that time. But the Rabbinical quibblers did not leave a lasting impression upon him. His character as a student won for him favor with the Jewish authorities. At some time, whether at Jerusalem or Tarsus, he became acquainted with the Greek language and to some extent with Greek literature. His grammar is faulty but he used the language with a vigor and mastery that is marvellous. Weiss thinks that his knowledge of it was gathered not from books but from intercourse with the Greek people. If that be true, it shows a wonderful genius little short of direct inspiration. During the ten years he spent in Tarsus after his conversion he must have been engaged in preparation for the special work to which

* Ramsay: *St. Paul The Traveller*.

he knew he had been called. It was most probably at this time he obtained that Hellenic culture that he used so effectively as the Apostle to the Gentiles. He came back to his native city in the strength of early manhood, with his mental faculties well disciplined and with his purpose in life fully formed. He was at that time of life when he would make the greatest intellectual strides and lay the broadest and deepest foundation for his subsequent work.

As a student he was taught to believe in the supernatural but he was not ignorant of the contrary view. The Sadducees were sceptics, denying the existence of angels and spirits and the resurrection. They had possession of the High Priesthood and were strong in the Sanhedrim. Their prominence would force their peculiar opinions upon the attention of intellectual young men. If he accepted the faith of his fathers it was not without personal examination.

His character is unimpeachable. He was one of the most conscientious of the Pharisees. He tells us that he was one of the strictest of the sect, the strictest of the strict and lived in all good conscience before God and men. His standards may have been too low in some matters and too exacting in others, but he was not conscious of falling below them. He was honest and truthful. His zeal for the faith as he had received it and his intense devotion to the law made him a persecutor. He made havoc of the Christians in Jerusalem and was entrusted with letters of prosecution from the Sanhedrim to carry his bloody work to Damascus. Though we have no sympathy with his work, we cannot but admire his earnestness in carrying out his convictions. It is strange that the most narrow and bigoted of the Jews should become the most catholic of Christians. It is the more remarkable because the great revolution came suddenly as he was riding along the highway.

His journey to Damascus was the great epoch in his life. He was about thirty years of age, strong in health and full of energy. There is not the slightest intimation of any physical infirmity whatever or any previous visions or trances. He was

still, according to his own statement, perfectly convinced that Christianity was a dangerous heresy. "I verily thought with myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth." (Act 26: 9). But on the way to Damascus he was converted, and from that time to his martyrdom he gave himself with unreserved consecration to the cause he had before so bitterly opposed.

What he had known about Christianity prior to this event is largely a matter of inference. He was probably in Jerusalem during our Lord's ministry but from his own statement it is commonly believed that he never saw him. He may have been out of the city at the time of the crucifixion. He had heard of Stephen's defense and witnessed his triumphant death. Weiss thinks that most likely he belonged to the Cilician synagogue whose members disputed much with Stephen and, therefore, he looked on while he was being stoned. But his association with the first martyr seems to have intensified his hatred of a religion which could awaken such insane fanaticism. His commission from the Sanhedrim shows an intimacy with the Jewish authorities that put him in possession of everything that seemed prejudicial to Christianity, and was likely to stir his zeal. While very much that they told him was false it is certain that they gave him no proof of any serious fraud on the part of the disciples. The authorities, therefore, did not know that the statements of the Christians about the life, miracles and resurrection of Jesus were false.

Paul's first experience of the supernatural was at his conversion. There are three accounts of it given in the Acts: (9: 1-20; 22: 6-16; 26: 12-18). They are all from the same source. The first is given by the historian from some earlier record; the other two claim to be directly from Paul himself. The author of Acts evidently from the space given it regarded it as an exceedingly important event. If Luke is the author of Acts, as the preponderating and increasing weight of evidence shows, we have Paul's statement as he heard it on at least two separate occasions. There are numerous references in the Pauline epistles corroborating the history in Acts. There can be no

doubt that something very extraordinary occurred at that time. Upon it Paul based his claim to be an Apostle of equal authority with the twelve. He never betrayed the slightest doubt as to the objective reality of the vision. Two things are certain, that in Acts we have substantially the facts as Paul conceived them and in his epistles his own interpretation of them as miraculous. The only question that remains is, was he mistaken?

He had ample time to study its meaning and test its validity. Soon after his baptism he left Damascus and went into retirement in Arabia. This part of his life is sketched by himself. "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were before me but went I into Arabia and returned again to Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to see Peter and abode with him fifteen days." (Gal. 1: 16 18). He takes a Jewish oath in confirmation of the whole account. "Now the things which I write unto you behold before God I lie not. (v. 20). The three years' study confirmed him in the conviction that he had received a direct and independent revelation. He did not feel the need of the help of the companions of the Lord. When at last he goes to see Peter, he remains only fifteen days. He may have gone to consult him about methods of work, and not about facts and principles. At least he does not confess to any special obligations to Peter for any material assistance received from him. He goes soon after into Syria and then to Tarsus for the purpose of developing his own resources and becoming more thoroughly fitted for his own peculiar field. The remainder of his life was a verification of his divine call. His convictions unless they had been most thoroughly grounded would have been put under an insupportable strain by his sufferings. "Three times beaten with rods, once stoned, three times shipwrecked, besides the perils of waters, perils of robbers, perils by his own countrymen, in perils by heathens, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren."—Thus he rapidly sketched the dangers to which he had been exposed. Once at least he was compelled to enter the arena and fight with wild beasts. He lived as one under

sentence of death, and hourly in danger of execution. His arduous labors were carried on under difficulties, dangers, self-denials and sufferings that had never been experienced. But his faith never waned. Ardent, fiery temperaments like his have violent reactions and sometimes sink into the gloom of black despondency, but one thing he never doubted and that was his immediate, miraculous call to be an Apostle. Nothing that he subsequently experienced can cast a shadow of suspicion upon the very real, positive, objective vision of the risen Christ. The beginning of such a life had its ground in certainty. No stronger proof of his unfaltering belief could possibly be given. Was it after all merely subjective? The story of his conversion has been assailed from several different standpoints.

1. The authenticity of the records has been questioned. Some have said that the Acts is the work of a bungling editor of the second century, but Ramsay, trained first in the Tübingen school and afterwards making a special study of the travels of Paul, pronounces Luke a historian of the first order. Some who recognize Luke as the author say that the accounts of the conversion are contradictory. Weiss says, "Luke repeatedly heard the Apostle describe the vision and has himself given a free representation of it but even apart from these free representations that are not entirely reconcilable," &c. The author of Acts did not regard them contradictory. Admitting for the moment that in part they cannot now be reconciled, it is still true that they agree in all essential particulars. But when we come to study them the reason for the charge against them is not very clear. In chapter ninth it is said, "The men who journeyed with him stood speechless hearing a *voice* but seeing *no man*." In chapter twenty-second it is said, "They that were with me saw *the light* and were afraid but they heard not the voice *that spake to me*." But here there is no contradiction. The men saw the light but not the Lord, and heard the sound of the voice but not the words spoken to Paul. In chapter twenty-second it is said that Ananias told Paul that he was to be "a witness unto all men of what thou has seen and

heard," but in chapter twenty-sixth it is the Lord who said, "I have appeared unto thee for this purpose to make thee a witness both of the things thou has seen and of those in the which I will appear unto thee." Part of the words may have been spoken twice, first by the Lord and then repeated by Ananias. Paul condenses the account and puts together the two announcements, as both were supernatural.* The discrepancies served to confirm the account. A fabrication would not have introduced them or a late editor, unless sure of their harmony, permitted them to remain. Nor would a fabricator take an obscure man like Ananias, of whom we know absolutely nothing beyond his part in this incident, to render such a service to so great a man as Paul. He would have sent Peter or John or at least one of the twelve down to Damascus to baptize the great Apostle to the Gentiles. The fact of the vision, confirmed as it is by Paul's letters, must be admitted as historic.

The vision was either an objective reality and thus supernatural, or a subjective delusion. The former was the interpre-

* Prof. B. W. Bacon in his story of St. Paul, just published, says, "The most important variation in this account is that which concerns the healing, baptism and instruction of the new convert by Ananias. Paul receives his call to preach to the Gentiles directly in the vision itself and at once obeys. Ananias disappears entirely from view in 26 : 16-18. In the narration of 9 : 6-30 Ananias is told of Paul's commission to the Gentiles which we are left to infer he repeated to Paul," p. 47. There are reasons for the variations. In the speech to Agrippa, Paul speaks his direct commission because there was no need of referring to Ananias whose chief office it was to baptize him. In the speech to the Jewish people it was more important to tell them of the "devout man according to the law and having a good report among the Jews." To neither does he speak of his baptism. In the ninth chapter the account is fuller and includes more than either of the others. Ananias hesitated to go to Paul and he is told of the great commission to remove those fears and to explain the wonderful vision Paul received. It is only an inference, and that not very well grounded, that Ananias said anything to Paul about the Gentiles, but if he did it was only to tell him all the Lord had said to him. It was purely incidental. Those who find irreconcilable variation here must certainly be looking for it. The authors habit of grouping things separated by years and faithfully recording documents as he received them and facts as he heard and saw them ought to be sufficient explanation of their accounts.

tation of Paul and his contemporaries and has been the faith of the Church in all ages. The burden of proof, therefore, lies with those who maintain the subjective theory. We turn then to :

2. The Rationalistic theories. The first is the illusion theory. It is not of recent origin but it was revived and made popular and plausible by the brilliant rhetoric of Renan. It is given by Dr. Schaff from his *Life of Jesus*. "Every step to Damascus excited in Paul bitter repentance; the shameful task of the hangman was intolerable to him; he felt as if he were kicking against the goads; the fatigue of travel added to his depression; a malignant fever suddenly seized him; the blood rushed to his head; the mind was filled with a picture of midnight darkness broken by flashes of lightning; it is probable that one of those sudden storms of Mount Hermon broke out which are unequaled for vehemence, and to the Jews the thunder was the voice of God, the lightning the fire of God. Certain it is that by a fearful stroke the persecutor was thrown to the ground and deprived of his senses; in his feverish delirium he mistook the lightning for a heavenly vision, the voice of thunder a voice from heaven; inflamed eyes, the beginning of ophthalmia, aided the delusion." It is a theory of perhapses. Perhaps remorse, perhaps a fever, perhaps a delirium, perhaps a thunder storm, perhaps the thunder mistaken for a voice and the lightning for a vision of Christ. It is strange that the attendants never told Paul that he had been sick and been overtaken by a terrific storm. Nothing of all these most remarkable coincidences is anywhere intimated in history. If we can think them possible can we believe that a man of Paul's character could have been their victim? The theory is too preposterous to be seriously entertained.

The second rationalistic theory is that of hallucination. This is more sane and more worthy of serious examination. It supposes that a psychological phenomenon was turned into honest self delusion. The appearance of Christ was the creation of a momentarily disordered brain and was mistaken for an objective reality. There are many analogous cases, as Mohammed, Swedenborg, Joan of Arc and even hundreds of others. But

will the facts in the experiences of Paul allow this natural explanation?

Stress is laid upon the reputed words of Christ. "It is hard for thee to kick against the goads."* It is said that they were the results of his doubts and a serious mental conflict. It is supposed that Paul had been deeply impressed by the death of Stephen and the repeated discussions he had held with Christians. Half convinced, his intense prejudice had prevented him from yielding and the suppressed convictions had turned him into a persecutor. But misgivings in a man of Paul's candor would have abated his zeal. He was on an errand of persecution when arrested and was least likely to fall into a state of mind so fatal to his immediate object and his future career as he had marked it out for himself. "How could a fanatical persecutor, breathing threatenings and slaughter, stultify and contradict himself by an imaginative conceit which tended to build up the very religion he was laboring to destroy?" Paul has the right to testify in his own case. He says that he verily thought he was doing God's service and that he obtained mercy because he did it ignorantly. The seventh chapter of Romans cannot be adduced as evidence in this case. There is not the slightest reason for believing that he had the remotest reference to his experiences on the way to Damascus.

But the chief strength of the theory lies in the fact that Paul had other visions. The supposition that he was an epileptic is wholly unsupported and is not necessary to the argument.

In Acts we are told of several of these visions. "And a vision appeared to Paul in the night." "There stood a man of Macedonia and prayed him saying come over into Macedonia and help us."† (16:9). Again in Corinth: "Then spake the

*Bacon says the goads were the providential arrangements fitting Paul for his life mission. The suggestion is worthy of attention.

†Prof. Bacon suggests that this vision and the one on the night of peril in the deep (Acts 27:23-24) find their explanation in "the automatic action of the mind which modern psychology designates as subliminal." He refers to the fact that "some of the greatest minds in history have been so constituted that the solution of their problems burst upon them unforseen in dreams or even trances according to temperament and condi-

Lord to Paul in the night by a vision: "Be not afraid but speak and hold not thy peace. For I am with thee and no man shall set on thee to hurt thee." (18 : 9). He tells in his defense before the people of a vision on a former visit to Jerusalem while praying in the temple. "I was in trance and saw the Lord saying, make haste and get thee quickly out of Jerusalem for they will not receive thy testimony," (22 : 17-18). On the night following his arrest as Luke tells us "The Lord stood by him and said, be of good cheer, Paul, for as thou has testified of me in Jerusalem so must thou be witness also at Rome," (23 : 11). He wrote to the Galatians that he went on one occasion to Jerusalem "by revelation" (2 : 2). The nature of that revelation he does not indicate. The one to which most importance is attached is that related in Second Corinthians. He regarded it as very peculiar. He had not before spoken of it to any one and he tells it now with much hesitancy. He confesses that he did not fully understand it: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago (whether in the body I cannot tell or whether out of the body I cannot tell, God knoweth) such a one caught up into the third heaven. How he was caught up into Paradise and heard unspeakable things which it is not lawful to man to utter" (11 : 2-4).

tion." (Story of St. Paul pp. 40-42). He cites the case of Luther and Pilate's stairway. There is an element of truth in this suggestion. Subconscious thought, first observed by Leibnitz and afterwards defended by Hamilton, is forcing itself more and more upon the attention of psychologists. All admit now that there is unconscious cerebration, but that does not seem to explain all the facts. Subliminal activity may have had its influence in some of Paul's visions and may have been used by God in making revelations to him. We have a great many instances in which God employed natural causes as instruments of miracles. If we may fall back upon Genesis we have examples in the dreams of Jacob and Joseph. To these two visions of Paul the vision in Jerusalem was similar and we have Paul's interpretation of that as a miracle. We are willing to trust his critical judgment upon it. Bacon admits that there was some kind of revelation in these visions. "Revelation it is and ever will be, no matter how much we may learn as to the mode of God working in it." If a revelation then there was a supernatural element and Paul was right in regarding the vision as a direct communication from God even though it was based upon his subliminal faith and reason.

Visions were not peculiar to Paul. Peter had the vision of the sheet let down from heaven which led to the baptism of Cornelius. The story is told by the historian and Peter alludes to it in his speech before the council in Jerusalem. If a hallucination, it is strange that messengers should meet him as he descended from the house top who gave it meaning. On another occasion when he was sleeping in prison between two soldiers an angel appeared to him and bade him arise. If a hallucination it is inexplicable that the chains fell off and the triple doors should be open.

Hallucinations in the same subject follow one general type. But those of Paul can be divided into four distinct classes. The vision of the night, the trance when the Lord gave him words of cheer, the vision of Paradise and the vision of his conversion. Cerebral disorder, the cause of hallucination, is local and when repeated is always in the same section of the brain producing the same or analogous visions. If Paul was subject to hallucinations he was a monomaniac and his case is absolutely peculiar in the history of mental diseases.

Hallucinations are confined to the subject. But the attendants of Paul shared in part the vision. According to his statement they all fell on the ground and they all saw the light, and according to the other account they all heard the sound of the voice. (Acts 26 : 14 ; 22 : 9).

Hallucination cannot account for Paul's blindness. He says, "I could not see for the glory of the light, being led by the hand of them that were with me I came to Damascus." He was three days without sight until one Ananias "came unto me and said unto me 'Brother Saul, receive thy sight. And the same hour I looked up upon him.'" (Acts 22 : 11-13). Hallucinations do not produce such physical effects as blindness which after three days is suddenly removed by the word of a stranger. Here was a fact that he distinctly remembered, and it was verified by all in his retinue. It was to him a perfect guarantee of the objective nature of his vision.

Hallucinations are the effects, and not causes, of disease. Paul's thorn in the flesh was a consequence of his vision of

Paradise. He knew of no natural relation between them. He says the thorn was given him lest he should be exalted above measure. What the thorn was we do not know. The conjectures are all without satisfactory support and afford us no light.

Paul's other visions confirm rather than discredit his experience on the way to Damascus. If he had experienced no other we might have questioned that one. It is not probable that the Lord after making one such marvellous manifestation would never again speak to him in dream or vision.

Paul observed the difference between his visions. About the one he had some uncertainty but not about the others. Of the one he speaks only once, but he often speaks of his conversion. The vision of the Christ on the way to Damascus was quite unlike those that came to him in dreams and trances. It was distinct and peculiar, without any parallel in his experience. The basis of such a great claim as a call * to be an Apostle along with the companions of the Lord, to be the equal of the pillars of the Church and to have the right to rebuke the chief leader, he must have examined in every light to assure himself of its reality and validity. His own explanation is entitled to more credit than that of modern critics. He knew a great deal more about it than they can possibly know.

If it was a hallucination, a mere subjective vision, Paul's whole Christian life and work was founded upon a delusion. The current of history was turned by a thing as baseless as a dream. Keim says, "The whole character of Paul, his chief understanding which was not weakened by his enthusiasm, the careful, cautious, measured, simple form of his statements, above all the total impression of his narration and the mighty echo of it in the unanimous, uncontradicted faith of primitive Christendom, are the proofs of the objective reality of the vision." † Baur in frequently quoted concessions said, "No psychological or dictatorial analysis of the experience can explore the inner mystery of the act in which God revealed his Son in Paul." "The sudden transformation of Paul from the most violent adversary

* 1 Cor. 9 : 1, Gal. 1 : 16 : 2 : 1-14, &c.

† Quoted by Dr. Schaff from *History of Christ*, Vol. III, p. 532.

of Christianity into the most determined herald, is nothing short of a miracle, and the miracle appears all the greater when we remember that in the revolution of his consciousness he broke the barriers of Judaism and rose out of particularism into the universalism of Christianity." Reuss of the same school, but a little later, said, "The conversion of Paul, if not an absolute miracle after the old theological pattern, is yet a most remarkable psychological problem. The so called natural explanations have to do for the most part merely with the known external phenomena, leaving the subjective element of the occurrence unexplained, while the traditional view, to save the former, entirely ignores the latter. It is evident from the oft repeated assertion of Paul that to his mind the appearance was objective and moreover not the only one, and that he was not conscious of having attained his Christianity from personal instruction of the Apostles. In view of these facts it is, to say the least, precarious to attempt to see in the occurrence nothing but a thunder storm and an overwrought imagination. On the other hand no sound theology can be satisfied with the solution of a compulsory, mechanical transformation of a great and noble soul."* Holstein, Pfeiderer, Schenkel and others had made similar concessions. The efforts of the great masters have acknowledgedly failed to torture the facts into harmony with the pantheistic theory. Paul's vision then was a clear instance of the supernatural.

Paul believed that he had revelations beyond those of the visions. He tells the Corinthians of "abundant revelations." He had faith in his own inspiration. He uses a tone of authority that would be inexcusable in any one not fully conscious of an immediate divine direction. The spirit of his ministry was that of an assurance of official infallibility. The distinction between his own opinion and that of his inspiration was clearly drawn in his own consciousness, and he does not hesitate to say it whenever he was in doubt. The Christian man was not absorbed in the inspired Apostle. In his personal life he walked

* History of the New Testament, Vol. I, p. 54.

as we do, by faith. Officially he was positive and dogmatic but personally he was modest, humble, self-distrustful and self-reproachful. He ascribed all the good that was in him to divine grace. Once he calls himself the chief of sinners. The Corinthian said his bodily presence was weak and his speech contemptible, but his letters are weighty. He replied that as he was in his letters, so he would be indeed when he came. He was writing about his authority which had been given him by the Lord (2 Cor. 10 : 8-11). The boldness, fearlessness and unquestioning spirit of his ministry * had its ground in his unfaltering confidence in the revelations given him.

Paul claimed to have performed miracles. He uses the words by which miracles are elsewhere in the New Testament designated : signs, wonders and mighty deeds. He appeals to them as credentials of his apostolic commission. The first is an incidental statement in the Epistle to the Romans : "For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath wrought by me to make the Gentiles obedient, by word and deed, by mighty signs and wonders, by the power of the Spirit of God, so that from Jerusalem and round about unto Illyricum I have fully preached the gospel of Christ," 15 : 18-19. Another is in the Epistle to the Galatians 3 : 5, "He that supplieth to you the Spirit and worketh miracles among you doeth he it by the works of the law or the hearing of faith?" He was writing to a church that had in it a party of enemies. He is vindicating his claims against their aspersions. He appeals to their own knowledge of the facts. Unless the miracles had been clear and manifest beyond question he would not have dared to summon them as witnesses. A third claim was made to the Corinthians. "Truly the signs of an Apostle were wrought among you in all patience, in signs and wonders and mighty deeds," 2 Cor. 12 : 12. Here again he was writing to people who had been turned into opponents and would accept nothing for fact except that which was beyond doubt. These appeals prove that Paul did things which were recognized

* 1 Cor. 2 : 12-13 ; Gal. 1 : 8.

by the whole community as miracles and that he himself had perfect confidence in their miraculous character. They prove also that Paul believed that similar miracles were wrought by the other Apostles. The appeals are admitted, and his own honest convictions are certain. He who denies that there were miracles must show that Paul was mistaken as to the character of his own powers.

In Acts we have records of some of the miracles performed by him. There is this general statement of his work in Corinth. "And God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs or aprons, and the disease departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them," 19 : 11-12. For some people this statement carries its own refutation upon its face. To their judgment it is preposterous. But there are facts occurring today which make us more cautious in rejecting the statement as false. Why could not God use as agents in miraculous cures certain psychical powers which are proved beyond doubt to exist, but which no one fully understands?

The first case given specifically is that of Elymas, the sorcerer, who was in the company of the Proconsul Sergius Paulas at Paphos in Cyprus. Paul filled with the Holy Ghost fixed his eyes upon him and said, "The hand of the Lord is upon thee and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there tell on him a mist and a darkness and he went about seeking some one to lead him," 13 : 6-13. The Proconsul was so impressed that he became a Christian. We do not know from what source the author of Acts learned the story, but it is most probable that it was from the Apostle. An incidental statement adds something to its confirmation. Both before and after this time Cyprus was an imperial province and its officer was a proprietor, but Zumpt discovered that at this particular period it was transferred to the control of the Senate, and its deputy is properly called by Luke, Proconsul. A spurious story of later date would have called him proprietor. There is no natural explanation of the facts possible except hypnotism. One can readily see how a rationalist might

turn the fact of Paul's fixing his eye upon him and the probable susceptibility of the sorcerer into a plausible argument. But no respectable author, so far as we know, has thought it worth while to resort to such a theory and we may dismiss it by saying that if ever done we can easily show that the conditions exclude it.

The second instance is the case of the man who was a cripple from his mother's womb and who had never walked. Paul said to him with a loud voice: "Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked" (14 : 8-12). The people of Lystra were so impressed with the miracle that they prepared to offer sacrifices to the Apostles and were with difficulty restrained. If this was a case of faith cure it is the most marvelous in history. The story most probably was told by Paul to Luke who recorded it.

The third case is related by an eyewitness, most probably by Luke. It is that of the girl at Philippi who was possessed of a spirit of divination and who annoyed Paul because for many days she "followed Paul and us and cried, These men are the servants of the most high God." He "turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of the Lord Jesus to come out of her. And he came out the same hour." (16 : 16-18). It was a notable case for it led to the arrest, trial in the midst of an excited multitude, and the imprisonment of Paul and Silas. Those who deny that there are demons or spirits of divination must find some explanation of facts so well authenticated. Clairvoyance, mindreading or whatever it may be of that sort is not exorcised or extirpated in a moment.

The fourth is given by the same eyewitness. The young man Entychus at Troas fell while asleep from the third story of the house where Paul was preaching "and was taken up dead." "Paul went down and fell on him and embracing him said, Trouble not yourselves for his life is in him." "And they brought the young man alive." If Luke was the eyewitness we have the opinion of a cultivated physician. The fall without a special providence would kill. If not entirely extinct the

by the whole community as miracles and that he himself had perfect confidence in their miraculous character. They prove also that Paul believed that similar miracles were wrought by the other Apostles. The appeals are admitted, and his own honest convictions are certain. He who denies that there were miracles must show that Paul was mistaken as to the character of his own powers.

In Acts we have records of some of the miracles performed by him. There is this general statement of his work in Corinth. "And God wrought special miracles by the hand of Paul so that from his body were brought unto the sick, handkerchiefs or aprons, and the disease departed from them and the evil spirits went out of them," 19 : 11-12. For some people this statement carries its own refutation upon its face. To their judgment it is preposterous. But there are facts occurring today which make us more cautious in rejecting the statement as false. Why could not God use as agents in miraculous cures certain psychical powers which are proved beyond doubt to exist, but which no one fully understands?

The first case given specifically is that of Elymas, the sorcerer, who was in the company of the Proconsul Sergius Paulas at Paphos in Cyprus. Paul filled with the Holy Ghost fixed his eyes upon him and said, "The hand of the Lord is upon thee and thou shalt be blind, not seeing the sun for a season. And immediately there fell on him a mist and a darkness and he went about seeking some one to lead him," 13 : 6-13. The Proconsul was so impressed that he became a Christian. We do not know from what source the author of Acts learned the story, but it is most probable that it was from the Apostle. An incidental statement adds something to its confirmation. Both before and after this time Cyprus was an imperial province and its officer was a proprietor, but Zumpt discovered that at this particular period it was transferred to the control of the Senate, and its deputy is properly called by Luke, Proconsul. A spurious story of later date would have called him proprietor. There is no natural explanation of the facts possible except hypnotism. One can readily see how a rationalist might

turn the fact of Paul's fixing his eye upon him and the probable susceptibility of the sorcerer into a plausible argument. But no respectable author, so far as we know, has thought it worth while to resort to such a theory and we may dismiss it by saying that if ever done we can easily show that the conditions exclude it.

The second instance is the case of the man who was a cripple from his mother's womb and who had never walked. Paul said to him with a loud voice: "Stand upright on thy feet. And he leaped and walked" (14 : 8-12). The people of Lystra were so impressed with the miracle that they prepared to offer sacrifices to the Apostles and were with difficulty restrained. If this was a case of faith cure it is the most marvelous in history. The story most probably was told by Paul to Luke who recorded it.

The third case is related by an eyewitness, most probably by Luke. It is that of the girl at Philippi who was possessed of a spirit of divination and who annoyed Paul because for many days she "followed Paul and us and cried, These men are the servants of the most high God." He "turned and said to the spirit, I command thee in the name of the Lord Jesus to come out of her. And he came out the same hour." (16 : 16-18). It was a notable case for it led to the arrest, trial in the midst of an excited multitude, and the imprisonment of Paul and Silas. Those who deny that there are demons or spirits of divination must find some explanation of facts so well authenticated. Clairvoyance, mindreading or whatever it may be of that sort is not exorcised or extirpated in a moment.

The fourth is given by the same eyewitness. The young man Entychus at Troas fell while asleep from the third story of the house where Paul was preaching "and was taken up dead." "Paul went down and fell on him and embracing him said, Trouble not yourselves for his life is in him." "And they brought the young man alive." If Luke was the eyewitness we have the opinion of a cultivated physician. The fall without a special providence would kill. If not entirely extinct the

man would have died from concussion. It seems a clear fact of miracle (20 : 8-12).

The last belongs to the same "we section." While Paul was placing some sticks on the fire on the island of Malta "a serpent fastened itself on his hand but he shook off the beast into the fire and felt no harm." (28 : 3-5). The people of the island knew that it was very venomous and expected Paul to fall down dead. In their opinion of the nature of the serpent Luke shared. If they were not mistaken, and there is no reason for believing that they were, it was certainly a miracle. In regard to the last three at least Paul is responsible for the conviction of his attendants because he knew that they thought that these deeds were miracles and he left them in that belief.

In his letters we have an implicit confirmation of the Gospel story. Their silence is as significant as explicit statement. He does not refer to a single one of the Lord's miracles, quotes very few of his sayings and mentions only one fact in his ministry. He does not repeat the story of the crucifixion nor give any account of the institution of baptism. He assumes that his readers are familiar with the story of the Lord's life. His allusions and references, indeed the whole of his epistles, would be meaningless without a knowledge of that story. They harmonize with our canonical Gospels. His letters presuppose full oral instruction, both in the fundamental facts of the history and in the elementary principles of Christianity. Everywhere he speaks of the Lord as if there were no need of repeating things with which they were perfectly acquainted. His four undisputed letters, to which we may most confidently appeal, were written to Gentile congregations. Two of them were established by himself and they had learned of Christ first from him. His arguments were based upon facts he had taught them. That story did not differ from the one told by the other Apostles, for any material difference would have been seized upon and used against him by the Judaizers who followed him. They availed themselves of every trivial thing to cast doubt upon his work and they would not have overlooked so important and effective a means as a serious departure from

tradition current in Jerusalem. But in his letters of defense there is no reference to any such charge and we are sure it was never made. It was the same story and when a few years afterwards the Gospels came to these churches they found it the same that Paul had given them.

We do not know certainly the source from which he obtained his knowledge of the life of the Lord. It has been inferred from his words to the Galatians that it was by immediate revelation. He says, "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them which were Apostles but I went into Arabia and returned again to Damascus." * To the Corinthians he wrote, "For I have received of the Lord that which I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed" &c. † This language certainly affords some grounds for the inference. Let us know that God does not work miracles when natural means are available. Beyschlag says, "It is utterly unnatural to think of an immediate revelation from hearers of facts such as the night in which Jesus was betrayed or the succession of the particular appearances of Jesus after his resurrection." ‡ He points out Paul's opportunity of learning much from the Christians in Jerusalem before he was converted and from the disciples in Damascus. Bacon asserts that Paul went up to Jerusalem to see Peter for the purpose of acquainting himself with Peter's store of recollections and teachings of the Lord. But the proof of his assertion is not conclusive. If we knew definitely what Paul did in Arabia we might be more certain about the origin and extent of his knowledge of the facts of the Gospel story. If he gave himself up to a profound study of the new religion he had adopted or if he was engaged in preaching he needed a fuller acquaintance with what the Lord said and did, than could be picked up on the streets of Jerusalem or gathered from the disciples in Damascus during the few days he was with them

* Gal. 1 : 16-17.

† 1 Cor. 11 : 23.

‡ *New Testament Theology*, Vol. 1, p. 19.

before he went to Arabia. The principles of Christianity can not be understood without the facts. Preaching in that early day, especially on missionary ground, was chiefly a narration of the story of Christ. Three years was a long time to wait for a thorough knowledge of what was so essential to him. While granting that Paul got much in the ways these scholars have indicated, it still seems probable that there is more in what appears to be Paul's claim of immediate revelation than they have admitted.

But interesting as the question is, it is not material to our present purpose. In any case Paul endorsed the story as we have it with all its supernatural facts. "Paul was a critic as well as a mystic," says Bacon. "If we imagine him as accepting without question whatever came in the form of vision or revelation we should be utterly mistaking our man. Paul is no more open to delusion by the mere mode in which an alleged truth presents itself than your modern scientist who knows that genius is nothing in the world but the scientific or poetic imagination (another term for brilliant guessing), and yet however grateful he may be for this mysterious endowment he holds every tempting suggestion down to the cold test of fact. It is Paul, this same seer of visions and revelations of the Lord, who bids the Thessalonians prove all things, (he is speaking of revelations), holding fast only that which can stand the test of moral judgment. It is this same dreamer Paul who demands that his Corinthian converts, shall subject every revelation to the test of reason and conscience, reminding them that the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets."* This has reference particularly to the visions, but Paul was equally critical and cautious in accepting historical facts about his Lord and he carefully tested them whatever the source from which he received them. The endorsement is of inestimable might and his testimony is unequivocal.

Paul, then, is an unimpeachable witness to the supernatural. His letters are evidence of his preëminent character and ability.

* The Story of St. Paul, p. 43.

We dare not deny the extraordinary importance of his judgment in that which enlisted and absorbed all the powers of his mind and heart. We must reconstruct his history and the principles of fair and honest historical criticism before we can deny that "God who in sundry times and divers manners spoke unto the fathers by the prophets hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son."

ARTICLE IV.

FOUR DECADES OF THE GENERAL SYNOD.

REV. S. E. GREENAWALT, A.M.

The great Church of the Reformation was an appeal to the supreme authority of the Word of God. It was no less a protest against the tyranny of mere human customs or traditions however hoary with age or widely accepted in practice. The touchstone of both doctrine and life was the revealed Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments.

The development of forms of worship and expressions of faith was not always and everywhere the same. These were influenced by both national and provincial peculiarities. There was one form of faith, however, accepted everywhere by those who followed the great Reformer and accepted his distinguishing name as their denominational title.

This was the Augsburg Confession, the work of Melancthon with the co-operation and approval of Luther. This is the Symbol of Ecumenical Lutheranism. Other symbols have been here and there added and have been marks of the particular rather than the universal in Lutheranism.

The prevailing spirit of the age will to a degree influence the religious thought and life of that age. It may do more, even give a trend to the faith and life of succeeding generations.

The skeptical and rationalistic spirit of the eighteenth century on the continent was manifest in many who came to make their homes in the new world. Widely divergent in faith and life were the early settlers of our own country that bore our

common denominational name. So true was this that when the founders of the General Synod prepared a Constitution that might find acceptance, as they hoped, among all the divergent representatives of the Lutheran faith in our land less than a century ago, even a mention of the chief Symbol of the Lutheran Church was not made therein as a test of the denominational soundness of the co-operating Synods. Section III, of Article III, reads: "All regularly constituted Lutheran Synods, holding the fundamental doctrines of the Bible as taught by our Church, not now in connection with the General Synod, may, at any time, become associated with it by adopting this Constitution, and sending delegates to its Convention according to the ratio specified." This was done, we are told, that the conscience of none might be burdened and lest the test of subscribing to symbol or the yielding to authority might be resented by the Synods extremely suspicious of any assumption of power, and very jealous of their privileges. The rationalism of the mother country had its followers in the new land, and the faith of many had been influenced thereby.

There was a determination, however, on the part of the most influential founders of the Synod, to exalt the ancient Symbol of our faith to a higher place in the affections of the people and to a more hearty acceptance by the Church than had been the case in recent years. This is especially manifested in the Formula for the Government and Discipline of the Evangelical Lutheran Church and in the obligation taken by the Professors in the General Synod's Theological Seminary, at Gettysburg, from its founding, in which occurs the following sentence: "I believe the Augsburg Confession and the Catechism of Luther to be a summary and just exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the word of God." "And I do solemnly promise not to teach anything either directly or by insinuation, which shall appear to me to contradict, or to be in any degree, more or less remote, inconsistent with the doctrines or principles avowed in this declaration" &c. This was the obligation assumed by Rev. Dr. S. S. Schmucker in the beginning of the Seminary, and the same that was taken by Dr. J. A. Brown, his successor, in 1865, and it is unchanged to this day. This was possibly the

strongest declaration of confessional subscription in our Church for that period. That not all Lutheran ministers or Synods measured up to this is doubtless true. Even the Pennsylvania Synod which withdrew from the General Synod after the first meeting and did not re-enter until thirty years later, 1853, did not even have the recognition of the Augsburg Confession in its constitution until the year of its re-entering, when the following was adopted: "Resolved, That we, also, in common with the Evangelical Lutheran Church of our fathers, acknowledge the collective body of the Symbolical Books, as the historical and confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of former times, accord to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, an especial importance among our Symbolical Books generally." But my especial task is to present the later period of the General Synod's history beginning with 1864. It must of necessity be incomplete and faulty, a mere sketch of an important period in our Church life.

1860 was an eventful year in our Nation, in that the events presaged peace and unity, by the close of the struggle between the states. It was an eventful year in our Church, in that conflict and division were presaged between Synods and members united in one general body in our Lutheran faith. 1861 had seen the culmination of territorial expansion to that time and seemed to bid fair to realize the desire of the founders, collecting in one body all the scattered synodical organizations of our Lutheran Zion. There were then 27 district synods in 14 states, from New York to Texas and from New Jersey to Iowa. There were enrolled 875 ministers, 1662 churches and 165,826 members, while outside this general organization there were reported but 471 ministers, 784 churches and 72,200 members.

The meeting of the General Synod in York in 1864 saw 24 synods represented, two, Minnisota and the Franckean, being received at this session. The reception of the later was conditioned upon its formal acceptance of the Augsburg Confession at the next regular meeting. This is claimed in intention and

fact to have been done upon its adoption of the General Synod's Constitution.

This act of the General Synod was the occasion of the Pennsylvania Synod, which had opposed the reception of the Franckean Synod on these conditions, entering a protest against the action of the Synod and its delegation withdrawing to report to their own Synod; thus they had no further part in the sessions of this synodical meeting and asked that their names be removed from all committees. This right of withdrawal in certain contingencies they had reserved when they re-entered the General Synod in 1853 according to their records, but no minute of such reservation was recorded by the General Synod at the time. This was the beginning of the division which was accomplished two years latter at Ft. Wayne.

Important resolutions relative to the teaching of the Confession were passed at this meeting. These are known as the York resolutions and were meant to correct some current teaching and to define the Synod's understanding of the Confession.

Whereas, Our Churches have been agitated by the imputation of grave and dangerous errors in this Confession, so that amid conflicting statements many who are sincerely desirous of knowing the truth are distracted, knowing not what to believe, whereby the danger of internal conflict and schism is greatly increased: And

Whereas, The General Synod, according to its Constitution, "shall apply all their powers, their prayers and their means towards the prevention of schism among us," we, therefore, in Synod assembled, in the presence of the Searcher of hearts, desire to declare to our Churches and before the world our judgment in regard to the imputation of these errors and the alienation among brethren which may arise from them: Therefore,

Resolved, That while this Synod, resting on the word of God as the sole authority in matters of faith on its infallible warrant, rejects the Romish doctrine of the real presence or Transubstantiation, and with it the doctrine of Consubstantiation; rejects the Romish mass, and all ceremonies distinctive of the

mass; denies any power in the sacraments, as an *opus operatum*, or that the blessings of Baptism and the Lord's Supper can be received without faith; rejects auricular confession and priestly absolution; holds that there is no priesthood on earth, but that of all believers, and that God only can forgive sins; and maintains the divine obligation of the Sabbath. And while we would, with our whole heart, reject any part of any Confession which taught doctrines in conflict with this, our testimony, nevertheless, before God and His Church, we declare that in our judgment the Augsburg Confession, properly interpreted, is in perfect consistence with this, our testimony, and with the Holy Scriptures as regards the errors specified.—*Minutes of the General Synod, York, Pa., May, 1864.*

They have been reaffirmed by the General Synod and printed along with the Confession. An important Constitutional amendment was proposed and handed down to the district Synods for their adoption. This made the acceptance of the Augsburg Confession a condition of entrance to all future Synods and at the same time was a stronger official recognition of the Augustana in the Constitution of the General Synod than hitherto existed. These acts served to define more clearly than hitherto the confessional basis of the General Synod and aimed at avoiding misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the same.

The Institutions of the Church at this time as reported in the year book were as follows: Theological Seminaries, Hartwick, (1816); Gettysburg, (1825); Wittenberg, (1845); Illinois State University, (1853); Missionary Institute, (1859); Theological Seminary at Philadelphia, (1864). Colleges: Pennsylvania, (1832); Wittenberg, (1845); Iowa, (1860), at Albion. Academies: Hartwick, Selinsgrove, Muhlenberg, Johnstown Academy, Hanover Collegiate Institute, Markleville Academy, Washington Hall, (Trapp, Pa.); Elysberg Academy, Leechberg Academy, Shippensville and Aaronsberg. Female Seminaries: Lutherville, Gettysburg, Susquehanna, Mendota, Springfield, (Ill). General Synod Societies at that time were: The Parent Educational Society, Foreign Missionary Society,

Home Missionary Society, Church Extension Society, Publication Society and Historical Society.

The next convention of the General Synod at Ft. Wayne, Ind., in 1866, was looked forward to with great interest. The two years intervening were years of discussion and conjecture. Delegates from 21 Synods were present and participated in the organization of the Twenty-second convention of the General Synod. The delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod were present but during the organization of the Synod, when the name of this Synod was reached, the President made the following ruling concerning their present relation to the General Synod: "The Chair regards the acts of the Pennsylvania Synod, by which they severed their practical relation with the General Synod, and withdrew from the partnership of the Synods in governing functions of the General Synods, as the act of the Synod of Pennsylvania, and consequently that Synod was out of practical union with the General Synod up to the adjournment of the last convention, and as we cannot know officially what the action of that Synod has been since, she must be considered as in that state of practical withdrawal from the governing functions of the General Synod, until the General Synod can receive a report of an act restoring her practical relations to the General Synod; as no such report can be received until said Synod is organized, the Chair cannot know any paper offered at this stage of the proceedings of the Synod as a certificate of delegation to this body." An appeal was made from the ruling of the Chair and the Chair was sustained by a vote of 77 to 24. The Synod thus made the act of the President its own and the delegates of the Pennsylvania Synod were not permitted to participate in the organization. Soon after the organization, however, a committee to consider the matter of the Pennsylvania Synod and report was appointed. No credentials, however, were presented. This subject occupied the time of the Synod for several days. Both sides were heard upon the floor of the Synod. Efforts were made to reconcile all parties.

A resolution at length was passed expressing a willingness to receive the Pennsylvania Synod, and another urging these

delegates to waive what might seem to them an irregularity in the present organization and to acquiesce in the same. The final response of the delegation asked the General body to admit that it was wrong and that the Pennsylvania Synod's contention was just, and if this were done they would come as "equals with equals." This the General Synod felt it could not do without dishonoring its own act, and refused. The Pennsylvania Synod delegation then withdrew finally from the General Synod. A protest against the action of the Synod in the case was presented by representatives of the Ministerium of New York, Pittsburg Synod, The English Synod of Ohio, English Synod of Iowa, Synod of Northern Indiana, Hartwick, Minnesota, and Synod of Illinois, in all 22 delegates. A committee to reply presenting the ground for the General Synod's action was appointed and later in the session rendered its report. All effort at reconciliation failed and the hope so fondly cherished for a united Lutheran Church in America was to be long delayed if not entirely thwarted. Doctrinal and liturgical differences were not urged on the floor of the Synod as any ground of division but the question was fought out on the technicality of the President's ruling upon which good men honestly differed.

To many then and now this division seemed wholly unjustifiable, unfortunate and in every way regrettable. Some who but recently were the strong defenders of the General Synod, who had spoken with great warmth and ability of her doctrinal basis and religious life, her genius and achievements, now were found speaking disparagingly of both her men and her measures. Long-time friends became alienated and harsh speech was some times indulged that embittered individuals and injured the cause of Lutheranism and the cause of Christ.

A sentence from the report upon the state of the Church may interest.

"Your committee expresses the hope that in the future the mind and heart of the Church will be less engaged with matters of controversy, and more earnestly in the developing of the field in which God in his providence has placed us as laborers. They further cherish the hope that the time is not far distant

when, we trust, there will be also a greater conformity in our forms of Church service, in accordance with the teaching of God's word and the historic character of the Church of the Reformation."

The report of the committee on literary and theological institutions reported the endowment of Wittenburg College to be over \$100,000, and the enrollment of students above 200, and that to this date there had gone into the ministry from this school 100 men, being just 15 less than the entire number of its graduates.

The new general body, the General Council, was soon after formed. The old General Synod had its numerical strength lessened by these defections. First the Southern Synods withdrew during the Civil War, and now further withdrawals, as here indicated.

In some places, as had been the case for years previous, the strictly Lutheran methods and practices, forms of worship, and religious phraseology, were largely influenced by the surrounding denominational activity and teaching. The "new methods" as they were called were practiced by many of our Ministers. Especially was this true of what was the then "West." Many causes contributed to this which we have not the time to discuss here. Among these causes was the reaction from a rationalistic influence in the past. The very spirit of the time and religious life of many communities strongly influenced the Church. The influence of other denominations was felt and the misunderstanding and misrepresentation of the spirit of our Church did something to aid this matter also. Two men of splendid and efficient service in this period upon our own territory, both now having entered upon their reward, told me of the extreme difficulty in overcoming prejudice and misrepresentation, and those that influenced them in methods which otherwise they would not have followed. Some good came of it and possibly some harm also, but it is of the past.

The reaction and disintegration seemed to have reached its limit by 1868, two years after the division at Ft. Wayne. The report of that meeting revealed that now there were 590 min-

isters, 970 churches, 86,198 members and the total benevolence was \$115,609.

The spirit of the Synod at that time, judged from the report on the state of the Church, was one of hope. While they deplored the loss of three Synods and part of three others in the formation of the General Council, they rejoiced in the unity, peace and harmony existing and the attainment of a more compact and effective working power. At this session the revised Constitution was finally adopted, the district Synods having approved the same. This made the definite statement of the "acceptance of the Old and New Testament as the only infallible rule of faith and practice and the Augsburg Confession as a correct exhibition of the fundamental doctrines of the divine word and the faith of our Church founded on that word."

Among the needs of the Church were mentioned "the need of more men for the ministry, more liberality in the benevolent operations of the Church and more earnestness in the Master's work by both the clergy and laity. About 60 young men with the ministry in view were reported to be in the college classes of Gettysburg, and a like number in Wittenberg. An appeal was issued and published in the Church papers urging the need of more young men to prepare themselves for the ministry of the word.

The next meeting of the General Synod was the following year in Washington, D. C.; 22 Synods were represented including the Synod of Kansas, received at this session. Arrangements were made for the transfer of the work of the Church Extension, Home and Foreign Missionary Societies to Boards to be appointed by the General Synod directly. This marks the beginning of these Boards as we know them today in their efficient work for the Church. At this meeting also was adopted an order of public worship which has been known as the Washington service. It was an advance liturgically upon what was used in most of the churches at the time and aimed at more uniformity in mode worship.

The report of the committee on revision of the Hymn book was received and adopted and the book recommended for publication. It was to contain beside the selected hymns, the Morning

and Evening service, the Augsburg Confession, Formula of Government and Discipline, Luther's Smaller Catechism, and a series of Family Prayers. A committee on statistics was appointed to collate facts and data of interest to present at the next meeting of Synod. The number of members reported was 91,720.

The convention of 1873 was held in Canton, Ohio. The report showed 669 ministers, 1056 congregations, 99,246 members. This year was introduced the apportionment system for the benevolence of the Church. The condition of the Church is best seen from the report of the committee on the state of the Church which was presented by the Rev. Dr. Gotwald, from which report we quote a few sentences. "Both in respect to all that pertains to our external condition and our internal and real spiritual life and growth there is very much to gladden the heart of every lover of Zion. Never perhaps in our history as a General Synod have we enjoyed a more encouraging condition in all that relates to the visible prosperity of the Church than we do at present. The indications that our Church is advancing in spirituality and in intelligent scriptural piety are gratifying. As a Church we are growing in all that constitutes a healthful and genuine life. The especial needs of the Church of that period as they appeal to him are: 1. A concentration and union of efforts in all the various Church associations. 2. Enlarged systematic beneficence. 3. The great wants is men, active, devoted, well-qualified, prudent men for the ministry. 4. A higher state of piety, more personal holiness, more entire consecration to Christ." The Theological Department of Wittenberg was reported as discontinued for the present and the students advised to go to Gettysburg to prosecute their studies. This was but a temporary arrangement.

The close of the second decade of our study brings us to the Thirty-first Convention of the General Synod held at Springfield, Ohio. This was the first that the writer of this sketch had the privilege of looking in upon while a student in College. Dr. J. G. Morris presided. This was a period of the more complete organization of the Boards of the Church and

the employment of salaried secretaries who should give undivided attention to work of the extension of the Master's Kingdom. This period also marks the organization of the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society of the Church which has done so much to interest the women of the Church in this especial work. A new liturgy known as the Magee liturgy was adopted in this decade. That it was not wholly satisfactory is evidenced by the fact that a petition signed by 50 persons was presented asking for a committee to prepare a service and liturgical form more in harmony with the doctrines and usages of the Lutheran Church than the one then authorized. The General Synod reported 23 Synods, 845 Ministers, 1301 Churches, 128,338 Communicants.

Of its spirit this is said in the report on the state of the Church: "Our prosperity was never more bright and cheering than at the present. Our people are manifestly growing in intelligence, piety and liberality. They are with some unimportant exceptions becoming better acquainted with the history and doctrines of their own Church, acquiring a clearer and stronger Lutheran Christian consciousness, not in the direction of bigotry or exclusiveness, or cold orthodoxy and formalism, of hair-splitting distinctions in non-essential matters, but in that manly form of true Godliness restored to the world by Luther and his co-laborers, consisting in justification by faith, and good works as the fruit and evidences of faith. Our Ministers and people of the General Synod are becoming Lutheran in this direction; they are not ashamed of the Lutheran name nor of the Augsburg Confession." The benevolent contributions of this biennium amounted to about a quarter of a million dollars.

The Committee on Scarcity of Ministers presented a report deploring the existing fact, and proposing as a solution additional provision for beneficiary education, urging the Churches to increase salaries, and united prayer for more laborers. A uniform blank for the reports of all the Synods was recommended. The Synodical meeting at the close of the third decade was held at Canton, O., again, and was wel-

came in golden words by the late martyr President, then Governor of Ohio, William McKinley. In his address he used the following: "Respect for true religion and righteous life is on the increase. Men no longer feel constrained to conceal their faith to avoid derision. A religious spirit helps every man. It is at once a comfort and an inspiration in every relation in life. There is no substitute for it. It may be assailed by its enemies as it has been, but they offer nothing in its stead. It has stood the test of centuries and has never failed to help and bless mankind. It is stronger than at any previous period of its history and the Church is ever promoting its permanency and its power." This was a notable Synod in several respects. The Common Service which had been adopted in the last decade was used in full in the services, and the officiating Ministers according to the custom of the Church that acted as host wore the clerical robe. The overture for two Hymn Books was denied. The development of Luther's Smaller Catechism as presented by the Committee with some change was ordered printed for use in the Churches. The translation of Luther's Smaller Catechism and the Augsburg Confession was presented by the Committee. The Committee was instructed to prepare the order of Ministerial Acts. Overtures for practical co-operation of all Lutheran bodies in America were presented and acted upon favorably. A revision of the Hymns and Tunes in the Book of Worship was arranged for. Considerable interest was shown in the Deaconess work and the Home for the Aged just at this time made possible. The General Synod's deliverance upon the now much discussed question of Divorce was here made, in which advanced and thoroughly scriptural grounds were taken on this important question. The statistics for this biennium shows 26 Synods, 1027 Ministers, 1525 Congregations, 163,514 Members with a total Benevolence of \$443,168.

The report on the state of the Church represents Canton, 1893, as high water mark thus far for the General Synod. "The reports all indicated an earnest effort and rich results unequalled in any former period of our history. Whatever our differences may be, in this we are one; the spirit which pre-

vailed in the formation of this body, which has characterized all its history, and which has fostered its growth is in direct antagonism to all narrow exclusiveness. True to this spirit, we extend the fraternal hand to all God's true children of every name and faith. Every hand is lifted to bear onward the banner of our common Lutheranism. Not one would allow this banner to be lowered in the smallest measure. It is this spirit of abiding loyalty to its own, with fraternal regard for others which has placed this body in the line of the best progress of the Christian Church in modern times."

I will not call the attention here and now to the specific acts of the last decade or to the steps by which she has gained her present position. These are too recent for history and are in the memory of man. But we will present a condensation of the summary presented by the writer to the last meeting of the General Synod at Baltimore one year ago.

"As we stand by a mighty river's side currents are seen to retrograde, but they are merely the eddies along the shore. A further view will reveal the onward movement of the majestic stream sweeping toward the sea. It is so with the Church of God. There may be eddies of retrogression, but the mighty stream sweeps onward toward the throne. We have come to a period of peace and work. Not the peace of indifference or of death, but of earnest endeavor to attain an ideal, to build upon an ample and satisfactory foundation. The General Synod is none the less fraternal interdenominationally, she has grown more fraternal internal-synodically. A better understanding is being had between the different Synods of our great Lutheran household of faith and our own Synod has had an honorable part in its advancement. There is a growing heartiness in our own body also, in the general work of the Church. The teaching office of the Church is emphasized not only in the ministrations from the pulpit but also in the Catechetical class and the Sunday School as well. Forty years has marked a wonderful advance in our Foreign Mission management and development, the institutions of the Church have been planted upon that foreign soil, the Word is being preached, the children are being taught, the sick are being treated, the orphans are being

homed, and the most largely attended college of our Church is the Watt's Memorial of Guntur, India. She has come far short of fully facing the tremendous problem involved in the Savior's last command, but she is awakening. At home the larger cities of our land are being entered as never before by the Home Missionary agencies of the Church urged on by the double urgency of patriotism and piety combined. The need of trained workmen that need not be ashamed is still evident and the injunction is still imperative, Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he will send forth laborers into his harvest. The educational institutions of the Church are doing a noble work though hampered as yet by insufficient funds. But in this it seems a better day is dawning and more liberal gifts are in prospect, we are told, which means the possibility of better equipment. This is a day of great opportunity and consequent obligation. In the matters of teaching it is of great moment that all her schools are true to the integrity and authority of the Word in their teaching.

Great advance has been made in all lines of the Church's work and life during these years. As already indicated the Woman's Home and Foreign Missionary Society has come into being with its splendid record of achievement. The Missionary Journal and other publications of the Church have come into existence in this period. A splendid literature of our own has been created that makes ignorance of our Church inexcusable.

The Board of Education has been organized and has already done much in founding Midland College and The Western Theological Seminary, as well as aiding other schools of our Church. The Deaconess and Home for the Aged, Loysville Orphans' Home and now also the Oesterlen Orphans' Home, and the Western Home in Nachusa, Ill., are but some of the outward marks of progress of our General Synod. The benevolences of the Church during the last biennium of the report reached over a half million dollars. The General Synod takes her place among the religious forces of the new century better fitted to do valiant service for the Master than in any time in her history. The organization of her varied activities is more complete than in the past; she has awakened to a

consciousness of her treasures of doctrine and of worship ; she is undisturbed in her creed acceptance and Scriptural position ; she is content to be herself. She emphasizes the methods both historical and Scriptural, which have been honored of God in the past, and have proven themselves neither antiquated nor inefficient. She has led the host in the percentage of net gain in membership in recent years. We are grateful for a growth external that can in a measure be tabulated, but she recognizes that the truest measure of success is that life internal hid with Christ in God, made possible alone by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit for which she seeks and to which may she in all fullness attain.

ARTICLE V.

THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.

BY REV. R. W. MOTTERN, A.M.

The immortality of the soul is and has ever been a very commonly accepted belief among all nations of men whether Heathen or Christian. When the soul passes away from this tenement of human clay, mankind in general believe it exists somewhere in the spirit world, separated from the body and not subject to decay.

But when we consider the subject matter of this poor, frail compound of human clay, according to Shakespere, this material, fleshly form, when it is left deserted by the soul in the cold embrace of death, that this body shall be reanimated again by that self-same soul and again be a living, breathing, individual organism, this gives wide range for discussion. And when we consider that it matters not how long the body has lain in its last resting place, nor where or in what condition the soul left the body, nor yet the utter impossibility of human knowledge to discover the whereabouts of even the atoms of dust that once formed a human body, greater wonder and surprise will be manifested in the wisdom of the Almighty to reunite each individual soul with each identical body as it was at the time of natural death. This impossibility to all human

wisdom and philosophy, to resurrect a human body, after the life has become thoroughly and absolutely extinct, is the source of much doubt, unbelief and positive rejection on the part of many of the doctrine of the Resurrection of the Body as taught us in the Apostles' Creed, which same doctrine we as Christians universally accept and believe. But nevertheless in the Creed it stands, a grand and magnificent monument of the teaching of the Old Testament and the New Testament, of Christ and his own personal experience, the teaching of the Apostles and the faith of the Fathers of the early Christian Church, the ground-work of the faith of the noble band of reformers, that helped to mould and guide the life of the Christian Church onward in its glorious mission of salvation to the human race; and that same essential doctrine today holds its rightful place among the things to be believed among us as set forth in the Word of God. Today as ever it is the norm of practical Christian faith and it needs to be sounded forth more loud and clear as distance removes us from the earthly experience of Him who fully proved its reality.

In the study of this doctrine we observe it comes under the head of Eschatology, or of the Last Things. The time when the resurrection of the body is to take place in the plan and purpose of God, *i. e.*, the General Resurrection, is just preceding the General Judgment, when all, small and great are to stand before God to be judged according to the deeds done in the body, whether they be good or bad. At the time of the end of this present physical universe when this earth shall melt with fervent heat and the heavens be rolled together like a scroll, and the Lord Himself shall descend from the Right Hand of the Father, at the blast of the trumpet, the dead shall come forth from whatsoever hiding place, every nook and corner of the universe where they have been for centuries and ages, since the flight of years began. The General Resurrection shall absolutely put an end to time itself. For the consummation of the great salvation furnished mankind through the work and merits of Jesus Christ, shall have the most glorious conclusion in the Resurrection of the Body. Christ's salvation and meritorious work of redemption includes the entire human being,

his soul *and body*. Paul says, "waiting for the adoption to wit—the redemption of our body."

The subject of this paper is just as much an object for our faith as the redemption and salvation of our souls. For as believers in Jesus Christ we say in the Third Article of the Creed—"I believe the resurrection of the body."

Now the *doctrine* of the Resurrection of the Body belongs to the truths of Revelation, but the full realization of it, as a fact, is yet in the illimitable future. It will not do for us to court or indulge in speculations and theories, for they will not furnish us the desired information such as we obtain from a study of the Scriptures on this subject; and to this study we must confine ourselves. We desire to state that

The Resurrection of the Body is a Well Attested Fact of Scripture. The grand old prophet Isaiah gives us the first and clearest idea of the Resurrection of the human body. Ezekiel also hints at it very strongly in his remarkably picturesque vision of the Valley of Dry Bones, where each bone joined to its fellow bone, and all arose from the dead like a mighty host revived and reanimated. Daniel also clearly and unmistakably makes allusion to it, saying: "Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Job and the Psalmist speak beautifully and forcibly of the Resurrection of the Body. And indeed general was the teaching and understanding of the Old Testament on this subject, even at the time of the long looked for appearance of the Christ of God. A sect among the Jews called "Sadducees" brought just such an involved question to Christ for his opinion on it.

The Resurrection of the Body of Jesus Christ, the very body that died on the Cross, is today the best attested fact of history. No subject has received closer and more thorough investigation and none has more truthful and competent witnesses, eye witnesses, to the very fact itself.

When Christ gave up the ghost on the Cross, no human body was more thoroughly dead than His, proven so by Pilate, the Roman Governor, the Roman Centurion and the Roman soldiers, all of whom had no special interest in the matter. His body was put to the most severe test and strain, that could be

given a human being, first deprived of sleep for a whole night, then roughly handled, lashed, beaten, buffeted, nailed hand and foot to the cross; then thrust in the side with a spear by Roman soldiers to see if He were really dead, and the presence of the flowing blood and water from his side, and then His actual burial, the same as any ordinary human being—all, all taken together fully satisfy the demand for proofs of His real and actual death. His close and intimate friends saw His dead body, which appeared the same in every particular as any other dead body. They tenderly prepared, or really embalmed it, for permanent burial with spices and bandages, and they had forever abandoned any hope of His ever returning in His recognized and familiar bodily form. And so certain were they that He was actually dead, and that every particle of life had disappeared, that when they, after His Resurrection, saw Him, they were the most difficult to be convinced that He was actually alive, and that He was the same Christ who died just three days before. Peter and John saw the empty tomb, and saw the linen bandages, that had been wound around His very body, all carefully folded up and lying in a corner of the tomb. The women before this had come with spices to further the preservation of his body, and found an angel sitting at the tomb, who said to them, "Come see the place where the Lord *lay* (past tense.)" "He is not here, He is risen" and as He said, "Go tell my disciples to go into the land of Galilee and there shall they see me." He was the very same Christ in physical form, though beautified, glorified, and highly wrought upon by the Spirit of God, and out of touch of further physical and material corruption and decay.

Mary Magdalene went to the tomb and found it empty, she thought that some one had carried His body away, and with great fright and surprise she recognized Him in the Garden. And as the women went to tell the disciples about what the angel had told them, Christ appeared in his very familiar physical-like form, and with joy they fell down and clasped Him by the feet. Christ also appeared to Simon Peter while he was alone. Two disciples while on their homeward journey from the Temple were met and joined by a third person, whom

afterward they recognized as the very crucified Christ while offering grace at the table. And on the evening of the same day while ten disciple, Thomas being absent, were assembled together, Christ bodily, not however with a psychical body, but a spiritual body made His appearance to them, even while the doors were bolted and the windows were closed, and with this spiritually endowed body Christ was able to penetrate the closed stone of the sepulchre, the closed doors, and did not have need for clothing and food. And he spoke to them by means of His lips and voice just as before, saying, "Behold my hands and my feet, handle me and see, a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." Thomas, having been informed of Christ's appearance, at once shuts himself against all hearsay evidence, and declared that he wanted positive proof for himself, that Christ had bodily risen from the dead; so one week later Thomas being present with the other disciples Christ showed Himself bodily again, (and may we not say,) purposely to convince Thomas before them all, that His very crucified body that had the nail prints in His hands and feet and spear thrust in His side, had arisen from the dead. Thomas's doubt was completely set at nought. He was compelled to say: "My Lord and my God." Several days after Jesus appeared to seven disciples along the Lake of Galilee and spoke especially to Peter. Not long after that He appeared again to the Eleven Disciples on an appointed mountain in Galilee. Immediately after that He showed Himself to the very large number of five hundred. James also saw Him at another time. And at the end of a forty-days sojourn on the earth He assembled the Eleven Disciples, giving them His last earthly command; before their very eyes, He ascended and a cloud received Him out of their sight. And because of what the disciples saw with their own eyes and heard with their own ears, they had such full proofs of Christ's bodily resurrection that they were willing to stake their lives on it and had no reason in the least to disbelieve or disprove it.

After our Lord's resurrection He was positively seen and recognized by no less than three eye witnesses. Stephen, a noteworthy disciple and deacon of the early Christian Church, said,

"Behold, I see the heavens opened and the Son of Man standing on the Right Hand of God." St. Paul saw the Lord after His resurrection and ascension, and even spoke to Him and received an answer from the Right Hand of God. "And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus; and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven: And He fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me? And he said, Who art thou Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks."

And St. John, the beloved Apostle, saw our Lord and heard Him on the "Isle called Patmos," saying: "I heard behind me a great voice as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and Omega." "And when I saw Him I fell at His feet as dead. And He laid His right hand upon me, saying unto me, Fear not; I am the first and the last: I am he that liveth and was dead, behold I am alive for evermore, Amen."

Christ could not have given His disciples better proof of His bodily resurrection than He so carefully did. The disciples built their lives upon the fact and lived accordingly, and at last died to prove what they had seen and believed. Their steadfast testimony of Christ's resurrection convinced thousands of others who likewise rested their hopes of the future upon it and surrendered their lives to prove what they believed. Nothing can possibly be found to account for the fearlessness and boldness of the apostles if we brush away the fact of Christ's bodily resurrection, for that fact alone inspired them and fired them with such courage as was never witnessed before by human beings. They caught up the new conception of what Christ's bodily resurrection meant, and with joy and gladness proclaimed it to a dying world. That the Sabbath day has been changed from the last to the first day of the week, is another positive evidence of the reality of the Resurrection. The existence and activity of the present Christian Church, is further evidence of the Resurrection. "Faith in mere visions or phantoms produce phantoms, but not such a phenomenon as the Christian Church, the greatest fact and the mightiest institution in the history of the world." And again

the resurrection of the actual body of Christ perfectly fits into the life of Christ, as a most necessary and essential part. The plan of God from before the foundation of the world would be woefully deficient without it, as the consummation of salvation, which was provided for in Christ's resurrection for both soul and body.

Christ's Bodily Resurrection is the Pattern and Pledge of Our Own Now. "He took not on Him the nature of angels; but He took on Him the seed of Abraham; therefore in all things it behooved Him to be made like unto His brethren." And "He took upon Him the form of a servant and was made in the likeness of men." And He was "found in fashion as a man." Thus Scripture tells us that the Christ of God was perfectly human as well as divine having the two natures in one person. Now therefore Christ was of flesh, blood and bones, and head and heart and lungs and took food as we, to sustain His body. He slept, He awoke, He wept, He walked the earth, He had a human disposition, human likes and dislikes, human traits of character, human love and was made like us exactly, but without sin—"who knew no sin," "neither was guile found in His mouth,"—died and was buried just the same as any other human being and hence by means of His glorious resurrection He has become the "First fruits" of those that sleep in the grave. When we see him resurrected bodily with all His physical capacities and mental activities just as before his death, except that He was not material—this is proof sufficient that each human form that existed since the flight of years began shall exist in the General Resurrection, at the end of time, come forth in glorified humanity with spiritualized bodies, exactly in the same shape, form and size as each possessed before death.

HOW THE DEAD ARE TO BE RAISED.

Death is a separation that holds at a distance the soul from the body—but for a limited time known only in the mind of God. The soul lives on and on and on, while the body is resolved back again into its chemical elements, for from those elements was it originally formed. As God said to Adam,

"Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return." But shall the body always remain as the dust of the earth? This body that has been so wonderfully and fearfully made, this workmanship of Heaven, shall it continue to lie in shapeless and hopeless ruins and never be gathered together again to be as it was once? It is not an impossible thing for God to raise the dead. He was the Almighty former and framer of our wonderful bodies in the beginning and that too out of *nothing*, and surely now He is abundantly able to repair the ravages of time and death and bring the separated soul and body together again. This separation is not one of permanent continuance, for there shall come a time when, as the words of Scripture positively assure us, in which the mighty power of God will work upon the dust of the ruined body and reunite each soul to each body to which it belonged previous to death. Now the means that God will employ is the Archangel's trumpet, which shall give one long and loud call, and all that are in the graves shall at once hear the command, "Arise and come to Judgment." All without an exception shall hear, though many millions had not heard for thousands of years. And those who are alive at the time shall cease their occupations, attend at once the all-commanding and new-creating fiat of the Almighty and be changed "in the twinkling of an eye," just as though their bodies had been dead and turned into dust long centuries before. No matter where the dust of the body shall be, whether it flies in the air, floats on the ocean, or grows in vegetation on the earth, it shall again be collected and form a living, animated, spiritualized body. The voice of the Son of God, through the Archangel's trumpet, shall speak all that was once human into existence again. That voice of God shall be life-giving at once without a moment's delay. And His command means that not only the bodies shall be together in their proper parts, bone for bone, joint for joint, but also that the souls which on earth dwelled in these bodies shall again re-inhabit them, whether the souls come from Heaven or Hell. Christ's command to the grave shall be, "Arise ye dead and come to Judgment." And His command to the redeemed in Heaven shall be, "Ye spirits of just men made perfect, all de-

scend to the world, from which ye originally came and assume your new formed bodies." His command to the evil spirits in Hell, shall be "Come forth and appear ye prisoners of darkness, and be again united to the bodies in which you once sinned, that in them ye may suffer." Thus will this summons spread throughout every corner of the universe, of Heaven and Hell and all their inhabitants shall hear and obey.

THE KIND OF BODY THE RESURRECTED BODY WILL BE.

The great mystery of the Resurrection shows itself just here. It is mysterious because it is beyond the reach of human reason, lying within the realm of the supernatural: and therefore there are many disposed to doubt the resurrection of the human body. But in some instances this may be, because some lay more stress on the body resurrected as being a material body than that it shall be a spiritualized one, a body more adapted to the realm of the supernatural than the natural. St. Paul plainly illustrates what sort of bodies we shall have. Our present bodies of flesh and blood, suited only for earthly conditions, can in no wise "inherit the Kingdom of God." This body is corruptible, mortal, easy of decay, a "vile body," and as such is no more suitable for spiritual conditions, than the angels are suitable for a life of earthly sojourn. This "mortal must put on immortality, this corruptible put on incorruption."

No better illustration of the resurrected body could possibly be given than that of St. Paul's, in which he speaks of the seed buried in the ground and springs forth into the plant—first the seed, then the plant, then the blossom, then the fruit. The fruit is identical with the seed, but it is not the seed; the life principle of the seed has made the fruit possible. And hence there has been a real connection from seed to fruit. However, "our future bodies may be no more like our present ones than a rose is like a black seed or a lily like the bulb." "We put into the ground an ugly bulb and it rises a golden lily; we drop into the mold a seed and it comes forth a brilliant flower, resplendent with magnificent colors; those are the same we put into the earth, the same identical, but oh, how different."

"How then can the seed and the plant be the same? Just as the plant grows out of the seed, the same plant always from the same kind of seed." The caterpillar becomes the butterfly, with most gorgeous colors. The ugly black charcoal becomes the hard, brilliant and valuable diamond. And thus the body, that will rise from the dust, will be in a legitimate sense the same that was buried, having undergone wonderful changes and transformations in the "twinkling of an eye."

Says Dr. Valentine, "even though not one atom of the dust of the former material body be used by the Almighty to construct our spiritual bodies and such cannot be entertained in our present theological thinking, yet the risen body will be 'our body.' "For though the seed sown dies and not a particle of its matter is found in the wheat grown, the life principle has carried the line of continuity over from the seed to the product and formed an identity between them." And thus it is not an *absolutely necessary* thing to have in it a particle or germ of the physical body that died or that "our body" shall come forth in its gross materiality. This then is at a great variance from the teaching of the old school, and probably of not a few of our Lutheran ministers, who believe and teach the shocking and revolting doctrine that at the General Resurrection the ruins of the human bodies scattered far and wide, "a limb in one country, here the head, and there the trunk," here the heart and there the body, "and at the sound of the trumpet they shall all be collected from wherever they had been scattered: all properly sorted and united wheresoever they had been confused, atom to its fellow-atom, bone to its fellow-bone and that all these several parts though scattered shall darken the air as they fly from country to country to join their proper parts." Now in answer to this with the almightiness of God it would not be an absolute necessity for Him who first formed man to require the scattered physical parts of the body before He would be able to change it to a spiritual body. That he is fully able to do with or without one atom of the original body as nucleus. Most theologians today reject the gross and materialistic views held by many as to the resurrected body.

The resurrected body will differ from the physical body in

many particulars. It will be free from decay and corruption and will endure eternally. While the natural body when dead becomes unsightly, earthly, pale, colorless and offensive, the spiritual body will become glorious, brilliant and most beautiful without the seeds of sickness and death, and will appear in the very highest perfection of which it is capable. It will be *glorified* and *glorious*, it will be clothed with ineffable honor, splendor and glory, and will shine with divine light, lustre and brilliancy.

It will be a powerful body because it is free from fleshly limitations, infirmities and appetites, pains and diseases, and hence will be strong, vigorous, not subject to suffering, free, agile, subtle, no weight nor gravity will be able to prevent it from being caught up with the Lord in the air. It will be a spiritual body, perfectly adapted to the mode of living in the heavenly atmosphere, yet it will not be spirit so-called, but a spiritual body, just like the angels, though it will not be an angel, nor equal to them. Our bodies will have spiritual adaptivities, never needing food nor drink nor sleep; they will be entirely under the control of the Holy Spirit. They will be heavenly also, will shine with great brilliancy and brightness, like our Savior's on the Mount of Transfiguration. They will no longer be subject to corruption, disfigurement, imperfection, be maimed, deformed, but ideally, beautifully perfect, complete in all their parts. Christ's own spiritualized body gives us an example of the happy qualities of the resurrected body. Our bodies will also be immortal. Paul says, "This mortal must put on immortality." The victory of the power of an endless life, the grace of Christ will forever crown the resurrected body.

But now the bodies of the wicked and the damned shall be immortal and incorruptible just the same as those who are blessed of God. They moreover shall be subject eternally to suffering, pain, tortures, shall have not the least glory, not the least honor, no power, no special beauty, but scarred by eternal foulness and disgrace, and shall continue in eternal darkness separated forever from everything that is good, cast off and abandoned of God, to whom the Judge of quick and dead shall

"How then can the seed and the plant be the same? Just as the plant grows out of the seed, the same plant always from the same kind of seed." The caterpillar becomes the butterfly, with most gorgeous colors. The ugly black charcoal becomes the hard, brilliant and valuable diamond. And thus the body, that will rise from the dust, will be in a legitimate sense the same that was buried, having undergone wonderful changes and transformations in the "twinkling of an eye."

Says Dr. Valentine, "even though not one atom of the dust of the former material body be used by the Almighty to construct our spiritual bodies and such cannot be entertained in our present theological thinking, yet the risen body will be 'our body.' "For though the seed sown dies and not a particle of its matter is found in the wheat grown, the life principle has carried the line of continuity over from the seed to the product and formed an identity between them." And thus it is not an *absolutely necessary* thing to have in it a particle or germ of the physical body that died or that "our body" shall come forth in its gross materiality. This then is at a great variance from the teaching of the old school, and probably of not a few of our Lutheran ministers, who believe and teach the shocking and revolting doctrine that at the General Resurrection the ruins of the human bodies scattered far and wide, "a limb in one country, here the head, and there the trunk," here the heart and there the body, "and at the sound of the trumpet they shall all be collected from wherever they had been scattered: all properly sorted and united wheresoever they had been confused, atom to its fellow-atom, bone to its fellow-bone and that all these several parts though scattered shall darken the air as they fly from country to country to join their proper parts." Now in answer to this with the almightiness of God it would not be an absolute necessity for Him who first formed man to require the scattered physical parts of the body before He would be able to change it to a spiritual body. That he is fully able to do with or without one atom of the original body as nucleus. Most theologians today reject the gross and materialistic views held by many as to the resurrected body.

The resurrected body will differ from the physical body in

many particulars. It will be free from decay and corruption and will endure eternally. While the natural body when dead becomes unsightly, earthly, pale, colorless and offensive, the spiritual body will become glorious, brilliant and most beautiful without the seeds of sickness and death, and will appear in the very highest perfection of which it is capable. It will be *glorified* and *glorious*, it will be clothed with ineffable honor, splendor and glory, and will shine with divine light, lustre and brilliancy.

It will be a powerful body because it is free from fleshly limitations, infirmities and appetites, pains and diseases, and hence will be strong, vigorous, not subject to suffering, free, agile, subtle, no weight nor gravity will be able to prevent it from being caught up with the Lord in the air. It will be a spiritual body, perfectly adapted to the mode of living in the heavenly atmosphere, yet it will not be spirit so-called, but a spiritual body, just like the angels, though it will not be an angel, nor equal to them. Our bodies will have spiritual adaptivities, never needing food nor drink nor sleep; they will be entirely under the control of the Holy Spirit. They will be heavenly also, will shine with great brilliancy and brightness, like our Savior's on the Mount of Transfiguration. They will no longer be subject to corruption, disfigurement, imperfection, be maimed, deformed, but ideally, beautifully perfect, complete in all their parts. Christ's own spiritualized body gives us an example of the happy qualities of the resurrected body. Our bodies will also be immortal. Paul says, "This mortal must put on immortality." The victory of the power of an endless life, the grace of Christ will forever crown the resurrected body.

But now the bodies of the wicked and the damned shall be immortal and incorruptible just the same as those who are blessed of God. They moreover shall be subject eternally to suffering, pain, tortures, shall have not the least glory, not the least honor, no power, no special beauty, but scarred by eternal foulness and disgrace, and shall continue in eternal darkness separated forever from everything that is good, cast off and abandoned of God, to whom the Judge of quick and dead shall

say—"Depart from me ye cursed into everlasting fire;" while the blessed of God shall have everlasting life rejoicing in their spiritual bodies, like unto our Savior's glorified body; for in His glorification at the Right Hand of God, His human-spiritualized body was carried to its very highest point of perfection possible. So Christ's glorified body on the Mount of Transfiguration, when "His face did shine as the sun, and His raiment as white as the light," is an example of what ours will become. "Eye hath not seen nor ear heard neither hath entered into the heart of man the refulgent brilliancy and brightness and enjoyment God has in store for those who love Him. Then thanks be unto God who giveth us the mighty victory through our Lord Jesus Christ, who said "Behold I am alive for evermore. Amen."

ARTICLE VI.

FAITH.

BY MARY DEVER.

"What if there lurk a might behind this might?"

There are two view-points from which it is possible to regard faith. The popular one is that faith is an eccentric action of the mind, possible at some times, but of doubtful possibility at others; that it touches some phases of human experience, while others lie entirely beyond its range; that only certain types of mind can ever exercise it at all; and that the man who possesses faith can no more tell how he came by it nor account for the manner of its operation than can the poet explain to others why the contemplation of certain aspects of nature that causes no emotion in ordinary minds brings to his lips a song of joy. The other explanation of faith is that it is a legitimate exercise of the highest function of the sum total of psychic life—call it mind, soul, spirit or what you will; that it is the conscious coöperation of the individual with the "power that makes for righteousness"; that in this coöperation man with full intent of purposeful action assists in the universe process of

evolution—the bringing into manifestation of higher types and the establishing of better conditions; that in the exercise of faith the infinite in man acts with the Infinite outside him; that it is not only *a* way but *the only* way of knowing the Divine; that a more excellent order already exists potentially and that man by the certitude that a nobler individual life and a nobler race life are possible, helps to bring such conditions into actuality.

To those who hold with the latter view, the words, "Great is thy faith," are highest praise, for they describe a mind that has power to live in spirit beyond the present material condition—that can endure as seeing Him who is invisible—that can manifest to others some sense of the presence of the God that his own soul discerns. To these the statement, "According to thy faith be it unto thee," is not a dramatic utterance of vague meaning, but the enunciation of a great underlying principle, that holds every day, every hour and in every possible circumstance.

The average man has faith of a certain order. It is vague, it is general. It has never been developed to the point of dependableness nor quickened into vital activity. It is not well-defined in its initiative, hence its results are not discernable—not because they do not exist, for every mental condition is productive of results—but because the faith exercised is so small and so pitifully jostled by fear and uncertainty. Such a man will tell you that he has an abiding confidence that the general tendency of all life—of the race-life and of his own particular life—is toward the good. But he tacitly assumes that many issues are of minor importance, if not utterly unrelated and irrelevant to the final issue. This position is untenable and is held only by persons whose thinking is careless in the extreme. How, we would like to ask such reasoners, can we speak of a general result that does not involve all causes contributing to it? How can we speak of the final issue of a life, whether racial or individual, without reckoning with its every event? Now, as a matter of truth, events in themselves are utterly unimportant and meaningless. If they never touched hu-

man beings we should care nothing about them. Considered apart from the persons whom they befall, they are disconnected, without significance, and entirely unworthy of serious thought. But when the event is taken in connection with that from which it should never be separated—its effect upon consciousness—then its importance becomes enormous, for it is the reaction of the mind upon the world that makes up the life of the individual. This reaction in unreflecting mentalities is spontaneous and beyond the control of the will. Development with such persons is slow and is accomplished only in the general upward movement of evolution. The action is wholly from without, for the internal has never coöperated with the external.

It is not so with the wide-open mind, the ever-sentient heart. To the man who thinks, who experiments, the so called material world is a vast and incomprehensible dynamic spectacle. It ever warns him of realms beyond realms, and by faith he enters them. All man-kind are the beneficiaries of his heroic confidence in what is just beyond, and by his service humanity comes into a richer heritage than fell to the lot of the followers of Joshua—the inventions that have changed the whole aspect of civilized life. They were heirs to houses and lands, but we of this later day inherit a body of knowledge bearing upon the natural sciences, and a bewildering maze of inventions whose immediate and accrued benefits can never be spoken in words or calculated in terms of value. These men have indeed spoken to the earth and it has taught them. Their reaction upon the physical world has been such that they have won from nature her secrets. By the power of their faith in the possibility of better conditions, those conditions were present in their own minds and they were later brought into actual human experience. They were obedient to a vision of something beyond the already known. Their response to nature was unique; they were the explorers, the pioneers of thought. Indeed, the Infinite can impart knowledge only as some one has faith that there is something to know beyond present realization. A conviction that nothing better is possible would in the moment of its acceptance close up every avenue of advancement and

render life a monotonous repetition of operators in comparison with which the most ordinary happenings of our hopeful lives would be events of thrilling interest.

Great indeed is our obligation to those who have won from the domain of ignorance whole kingdoms of knowledge, who have lengthened and broadened human life by increasing its bodily comfort; but greater far is our debt to those whose courage has enabled them to look away from self and in thus doing to discern "things not seen."

Just as the material world continually suggests to the scientist a more useful arrangement of some of its elements, a more helpful ordering of some of its phenomena; just as it tells him that never yet has he comprehended its perfect rhythm, its majestic sweep—for bits he knows, yet not the whole—so the great universe admonishes the man of faith that care, grief, loneliness, the disappointment of his hopes and the frustration of his plans are not his portion—that in spite of the seemingly hopeless nature of these outer happenings there can be built up a life of freedom, joy and victorious peace. The man without faith lays stress upon the *external event*, and thus travels over the well worn road that leads to nowhere. The man that *sees the invisible* knows that the internal reaction is the only thing of any importance to him. Events pass—he remains. But *the reaction* itself is not the end of the series. It is in reality the initial movement in a new series, for by it thought is modified. When the manner of a man's thinking is changed, whether greatly or ever so little, the man himself is changed. He is never quite the same again. We might add to Descartes' famous axiom, "I think—therefore I am," the postulate "My thought is modified—therefore I am modified."

The ordinary mind responds to poverty with a sense of restriction, of the starving of the body or mind according as it is the one or the other that seems of greater importance. Not so the Phrygian slave who in chains boasted of the freedom of his spirit. He was rich though lacking all things, and claimed his own mind as a kingdom. Again, positions of power tend ordinarily to the leading of a self-centered life—the willingness

to be ministered to. Yet because he discerned things not given to many to see the wisest of the Emperors of Rome could be simple amid imperial splendors, just in an age of oppression, true when surrounded by deceit, serene and unperturbed though administering the affairs of a nation of warriors.

Faith in its perfect exercise is not an agonizing conflict—one mental faculty arrayed against others. It is a firm and serene action of the whole mentality. It moves as Cæsar said of a certain river, "with incredible smoothness."

Unbelief retrenches, narrows, contracts, ventures less; faith stakes out large claims, and dares all things.

It is a singular fact that many who earnestly protest that they desire the life of faith confuse knowledge and faith, and thus defeat their own ends. If faith could be proven it would no longer be faith, but knowledge, which is a very different thing. An effort to give knowledge the precedence of faith renders the latter impossible. Faith rightly precedes knowledge, which indeed is only a summing up of results.

The operation of the mind in its acts of faith far transcends in importance all other reachings-out of the individual to the external. The free self-expression which conditions professional success, the unsentimental love that recognizes others as comrades, are themselves the result of a measure of faith, and may be turned to account as an increasing asset in the affairs of a future whose growth is victorious, whose adjustments are manifold and delicate, and whose love is tender and unselfish in a degree that is beyond our present power to grasp.

ARTICLE VII.

CURRENT THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

I. ENGLISH AND AMERICAN.

By Professor M. COOVER, A.M.

Associated with the mystery of sin is the mystery of suffering. Since the catastrophe at Martinique *The Hibbert Journal* beginning with its first issue has been furnishing interesting articles on human suffering, or "Catastrophes and the Moral Order." The cry is, How can an imperfect world issue from a being of eternal perfection!

There are as many attempted solutions as there are conceptions of life. Theist, rationalist, and metaphysician, each offers his suggestion at the shrine of the mystery. One says that evil is but good in disguise; evil is good in the making. This begs the whole question. Then there is no such thing as evil. Much Christian theology acutely resolved finds its home in this philosophy.

Buddhism at least is honest; it evades the whole question. For the Buddhist the only reality is non being. Present being is an illusion. Life is but a transient by-product of the evolution of a dream.

The whole universe is again and again rehearsed from hydrogen atom to thinking brain in one endless cycle, an everlasting goalless drift.

The modern materialist formulates his creed after the same fashion. Life is but a little ferment of oxygen and hydrogen; thought is the radiation of an electron. Each mind is a microcosm in miniature of the great macrocosm; a retina to epitomize a multiplex world; an electron containing inwardly the counterpart of all that takes place outwardly. Pain is the jarring of negative, repellent atoms; pleasure the marriage joy of blending chemicals. If there be any music in the wild whirl of

adventure in the world of cosmic atoms, it is the melody of dissonance.

We live to think the thinkable, but the thinkable is only dream fancies. Life is indeed being, but being evanescent with indistinctness and indefiniteness. Logic, after all, is but a flight along a milky way; a tangent at an unstable point of thought.

The metaphysician, too, offers his suggestions. We are phantasma in the dream of an infinite being, who, though omnipotent, cannot change the laws of his mental action; for he cannot awake himself from his own slumber. But when he awakes, we shall go where dreams go to. Shall we whisper, "Dream on," or cry, "Awake, thou that sleepest?" This universe is a cosmic nightmare whose dream-creatures we are, and who can dissipate the spell?

Sorrow and joy are the shadows which come and go with the movements of a fairy wand. Harmony and dissonance are one; we are such stuff as dreams are made of.

To treat the familiar as unfamiliar is half the secret of philosophy, says Leibnitz. Whether life be a dream or reality it still stands in need of explanation. If we consciously share in the nightmare, though creatures of a dream, we may yet try to explain the illusion. Especially in this age when respect is paid, not to faith, but to ratiocination, we should not be censured for our cogitations.

When we deny or ignore the problem of evil, we lose the meaning of moral good. Mazdeism struggled with the question and gave us a dualism. God is the sum of all moral perfections, the absolute goodness; but he is confronted by an absolute Foe, an eternal principal of evil. Two opposing eternal principles confront each other, out of the conflict of which all things emanate. From the conflict of negatives all positive existences have arisen.

But this is to surrender by its acceptance the singularity and significance of God. The mind seeks unity, and cannot rest in dualism. There can be but one eternal principle, and that absolute, and to satisfy the rational aspirations of man that Ab-

solute must be personal and moral. An impersonal and unmoral power cannot make for righteousness.

But if he be omnipotent, why does he permit evil? If he be all-powerful he cannot be the sum of all moral perfections; his goodness suffers in alliance with unbanished evil.

But there is our weakness; we know things only in part. We make of evil a separate problem, while it is part of a great whole. We set the world's pain in parenthesis, not to subordinate it, but to accentuate its features; we print it in italics to arrest attention; or depict it in capitals to appall by massivity. Exceptional convulsions of nature become agonizing problems. Pompeii and Herculaneum, St. Pierre and Slocum, bristle with interrogations that seem to impugn a righteous and just divine providence.

As knowledge comes through analysis and synthesis, and we can know wholes only by comprehending parts, by building thesis after seeing things in antithesis, we must become aware that if the whole suffers, if our conception of the Absolute makes him lacking in moral elements, it must be because our selective attention has been confined to parts, and too few parts have been comprehended to make a synthesis worthy of our rational conception of the Absolute. Our view of the moral order is but a fragmentary arc and not a complete circle. Many relations of existence unviewed make our concept incomplete.

Yet viewing things rightly in parts may mitigate the asperity of the aspect of the whole.

The nervous organism that feels pain is the same that occasions ecstatic pleasure. The brain is the center of pain and the center of thought. The same organic function that makes us suffer keenly, makes us think deeply as well. It is only the most sentient beings that can think at all. Should we lack susceptibility to suffering, we should lack power of thought and reason. Pains are a minimum when brains are small; creatures of meagre nerves suffer little, and think less. The least thing to be desired would be to have less susceptibility to suffering.

Though this be true, yet why should there be occasions of unusual suffering in the economy of divine Providence? Volcanic eruptions with lava-streams, earthquakes, storms, and floods, with appalling catastrophes, are seemingly unnecessary features of a well-ordered world.

But the world became habitable that way. Spinning through space it cooled and contracted, and still through cleft and fissure spits flame and lava-flood.

Were it better that the human drama had been deferred till the world were past all danger of flood and flame?

Should millions of years have been added to cosmic preparation, and man's advent delayed and his past achievements subtracted, in deference to a world flawless of possible conditions of danger, of convulsions and catastrophes? This is a conjectured past and future, but the possibilities may be weighed and measured. The relations of a universe in its making are too vast and complicate for us puny reasoners to correlate. An amended order to suit our modded system would end in chaos. Krakatoa may yet again paint the sunsets red all round the world, but let us not wish that the human drama were in unborn embryo until all such scenes had forever vanished, and the possibility of their recurrence forever foreclosed.

Thirty millions of human creatures die annually in circumstances of the natural order unforced by extreme conditions. Attendant upon this natural order are untold pains of widowhood and orphanage, pangs of parting, and the harassing sadness of slowly fading memories. This is natural; soon after the birth cry is crape on the door. Progress comes only by dissolution and reorganization of forms, by inheritance of accumulated experience.

But thirty thousand fall in one moment in Martinique unattended by prolonged suffering, with none left to agonize in parting, or to suffer widowhood and orphanage, and hands are lifted up in horror.

This view mitigates the severity of the moral shock, but does not banish the fact of suffering.

It, however, shows that suffering is a thing relative, a thing to be examined from many view points.

The world is red in tooth and claw; yes; and the excitement of the chase, and the agony of the capture, are anesthetic to pain itself. Quick unconsciousness is the world's greatest anesthetic for suffering.

But why necessarily? Let all animal life be herbivorous; why need there be omnivorous or carnivorous creatures? The sea, then, would be depopulated of almost all its animate creatures. The physical organisms of half the world's teeming population must be changed in adjustment to new conditions. Laws in relation innumerable would entail new coordinations.

Then let all animate life die a death painless by some sudden cause as apoplexy. But what agent would assume the world's sanitation? Millions of putrid forms would dot the earth, poisoning air, stream, and food. Men would be obliged to resolve themselves into a senate of sextons. Funeral directors must then patrol forest and field, and undertaking would become the supreme mission of thinking creatures. Then let carnivora remain, and have tooth and claw destroy dead animal forms. But the contest of talon and tooth of beast of prey over carcasses would entail more suffering and injury than the pains of capture in the single chase, and the sudden shock quickly culminating in unconsciousness.

Neither humanity dying by regiments, nor animal life in the struggle for existence, accentuates the suffering of the world. These are milder than the accustomed order, the pangs of slow dissolution.

Hunger, thirst, fatigue, are pains of want which are self-corrective. They perform the part of monitors for the world's health. The common pains of bodily disease are the severe forms of suffering, and these accomplish the order of the world's progress.

To think we must suffer. The same organic function is the agent of both. We must die to live, and there is one door to the mystery. To die with great moral fulness and spiritual

wealth we must die severely. But then we live the hereafter supremely.

The existence of conscience adds to human pangs. Religion makes a man die keenly, makes his apprehension acute. Conscience makes painful the past by regret, makes agony of the future by anticipation.

Perils of conscience, the moral creations of man before and behind, augment his sufferings beyond any pangs of suffering beast. If we live but for one world, woe to us! But if another is better through the throes of personal and vicarious pain, blessed be the pain that makes possible the eternal weight of glory. The surgeon is called for in an act of love. Pain is the cost of restored health and soundness.

The moral analogy is not irrelevant. And yet it is a mystery still. We know but little more than Job. If we say "we know," we deceive ourselves. But we know in part; and let us not be deceived.

Righteousness is the substance of God's love; love is the form of his righteousness. God expresses his love not only in his conduct of mercy, but in his conduct of discipline as well. God thinks truth and acts justice. He thinks in actions, or actions are his thoughts. Thought and action are one in God's exercise. His will is his holy nature and sovereign. The moral order of the world is no more obscure than the physical natural order. But remember, that order there must be, and transgression of it is suffering. The herd flees the foe, and in blood heat lies down in the cool canyon. The chilled lung becomes tubercular, and the world suffers.

A law has been violated, but law there must be. Heredity is necessary for accumulation of qualities and characteristics for physical and intellectual advance beyond old types and properties. Without it there is no progress. Defect is propagated by a law that works the world's advance. Chaos is obviated by existence of law; exemption would be perpetual miracle. God is a God of order. Sin is transgression, and the wages of sin is death.

To solve the mystery of suffering we turn from philosophy to

preaching, that is, the moral side of the question comes uppermost. In this effort at solution we point to salvation; in philosophy we do not speak to accentuate certitude. We would but suggest, rather than assert.

In the recent number of *The Expository Times* Professor Robert Mackintosh has been giving a series of articles on "The Dawn of the Messianic Consciousness." In the March number he gives us a moral study of Jesus' temptation with a psychological interpretation of the mind of Christ.

Prof. Mackintosh thinks that Jesus was awakened to his Messianic consciousness for the first at the time of his baptism; otherwise he would have met the occasions of his career with a programme already mapped out. The materials for such a programme were at hand; the Old Testament prophecies, and the inner revelation, the personal moral intuitions, divinely borne to his consciousness.

But in this supposition of pre-arrangement of a Messianic programme Prof. Mackintosh slights the system of a psychological interpretation of Jesus' character and career. To map out a programme involves the creation of events to suit his career. Occurrences are thus occasioned mechanically to fit sign and sermon, miracle and teaching. Jesus goes forth daily not to meet exigencies naturally arising, but to put together parts of a programme previously arranged.

Such a psychological and moral mechanism could scarcely answer to the ministry of Jesus.

A Messianic consciousness could arise and exist without a definite outline of a ministry, every detail of which was located and logically co-ordinated. The occasions need not be manufactured to suit a mechanical Messiah. Jesus was not lacking in system, but his plan scarcely involved a mechanical co-ordination of events. He was not man then, but a docetic appearance fitted into pre-arranged circumstances.

But a psychological study of Jesus will show glimmerings of a Messianic consciousness before the time of his baptism.

The pious household of Joseph and Mary, however spiritual its religious conceptions, was doubtless more or less influenced by the popular idea of the Messiah. The coming deliverer was not conceived to be a purely moral and spiritual Messiah. The political uprisings in Galilee were more materially expressive than suited the pious, *die Stillen im Lande*, yet politics was deemed a department in the Messiah's work. Jesus scarcely escaped the *Zeitgeist*, but how did he meet it? What were his youthful ambitions near the very time of the great uprising in Galilee under Judas?

A young man today feeling a call to special duty has two ideas of salvation or deliverance, and the predominant one will prevail. He will, if earnest and ambitious, be found in one of two situations; in a theological seminary, or a military academy.

When Jesus was missed where did his parents find him? In some quiet obscure nook in Galilee practicing with the sword? In the temple he was found surprised that any should surmise otherwise. "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?"

If he had any consciousness at all, this shows the trend of it, as well as its intrinsic character.

A psychological study of Jesus must begin before his baptism by John, and the pursuit of it will discover the youthful Jesus with an unusual consciousness of some great mission.

Prof. Mackintosh accepts the order of the temptations as set forth by Matt. regarding the words of Jesus, "Get thee behind me, Satan," as the close of the parley. The objective character of the trial is not definitely affirmed; it may have been occasioned by an external tempter, or a "simple train of thought." But "the train of thought," is evidently accepted by Prof. Mackintosh, for Jesus does not actually go to Jerusalem to test his trust in angelic care. There was no element of ostentation in the desire to leap from a pinnacle of the temple, thinks Prof. Mackintosh; no wish to influence men by the miraculous and startling.

This is possible; but if mere trial of trust in his Father's

care were the sole content of the temptation, the "train of thought" might well have stopped at the summit of a crag overhanging some wady.

The wilderness, the scene of his temptation, was doubtless environed by rocky ravines affording objective points for subjective trials. Jesus need not be in Jerusalem to be tempted to ostentation, but to go there in mind rather than to some place of seclusion is significant of spectacular demonstration.

Prof. Mackintosh interestingly classifies the three temptations as the self seeker of natural appetite, the fanatic, and the opportunist.

Most of us fall into temptation in the sphere of physical appetite, and the tempter need proceed no farther. But Jesus could not be seduced by appetite. He would not place himself outside the category of men by doing for himself what other men could not do for themselves. He would do miracles to relieve others' distresses, but not to alleviate his own. His character was above the plane of the self seeker. Man does not live by bread only. So Jesus will trust his Father for sustenance.

Then Satan rises higher; the sublimity of trust may become a spiritual temptation. The tempter has an ethical man to meet; reason may be pushed to unreason.

Trust God to the full; leap, and trust to angels' hands. Jesus may become a fanatic. But this has no force with Jesus.

All men dread suffering. Cannot high ends be attained without anguish and toil, sacrifice and crucial agony? Why agonize for ends that can be gotten for the mere asking? "Fall down and worship me," do as the worldly do, and the domain of the world shall be yours. Will Jesus be an opportunist?

The politician of today would deem such an offer the greatest opportunity of his life. He would spring at such a suggestion; he would leap to its acceptance.

But Jesus will not thus receive the heathen for his inheritance with their life of pagan pleasure. He will not make dogma out of the second Psalm apart from its great context. Neither fanaticism nor opportunism finds susceptibility in Jesus.

Prof. Mackintosh excludes the theory of Baldensperger, that the temptation lay in the wish for the power of miracle-working, a power not in the possession of Jesus. The theory of Dr. Sanday is the more keen and psychological, that this temptation manifests intrinsically and inherently in Jesus the possession of supernatural power. The predominant characteristics of a man's nature come to the surface in his temptations. He is tried where he is most susceptible, and he is susceptible where the play of his qualities has become confirmed and tends to the habitual.

At what point shall Satan approach Jesus? What is the predominant element in his moral constitution which may be inclined to act without awakening suspicion of wrong? Satan approaches men on the side of their susceptible human nature; but he approached Jesus on the side of his divine nature, the stronger part of his personality. It would be no temptation to you to turn stone into bread; for you could not do it.

What temptation could it have been for Jesus to have suggested to him something he could not do? The nature of the temptation suggested to Jesus shows inherently Jesus' power to work the miraculous. *Ex nihilo nihil fit*; the temptation was not a fiasco.

Prof. Mackintosh does not think that Jesus spent forty days in serious solemn meditations on Messianic rights and duties, aims and problems, in the wilderness. The environment was forgotten and his stay amid wild scenes was a long period of rapture, "a long rapture placed at the favorite conventional figure of forty days." First was God's presence, and the soul's delight in spiritual communion with the Father in the newly realized sonship of Jesus; then another presence, whether objective or subjective, the great mystery of sin embodied in mental disturbance, entitled temptations.

The forty days of fast associated with Jesus' fast in the wilderness was made by the early Church primarily to follow the feast of the Epiphany, Jan. 6th, the feast of Jesus' baptism.

After the controversy over the feast of the nativity the Church in the West transferred the forty days of fasting to the forty days preceding Easter. This Quadragesimal period supplanted the forty hours' fast celebrating the hours of our Lord's rest in the tomb.

Since Sundays were exempt from fasting only thirty six days remained; hence John Cassian called these the tithe of the days of the year due to God.

To complete the number forty the custom arose in the West, after the time of Gregory the Great, of beginning the fast on the previous Wednesday (Ash Wednesday, *Dies cinerum*). But the Church in Jerusalem before the beginning of the fifth century exempted Saturday and Sunday from the fast period and the Quadragesimal season was extended to eight weeks to complete the full forty days.

This period was a *tempus clausum*. All social engagements such as marriages, birthday observances and amusements, were discontinued. Criminal investigations and unnecessary business engagements were postponed. Palm Sunday introduced passion (torture) week. The chief days of the week following Palm Sunday were Thursday, the day on which the Eucharist was celebrated, *feria quintae paschae*. It was called Green Thursday, *dies viridum*. Foot-washing was also observed on this day, *dies pedilavii*. Friday was the *dies crucis*, *domini passionis*, and in the middle ages, Care Friday, *dies lamentationum*. Assemblies were held in cemeteries in celebration of the *descensus Christi*. Saturday was the favorite day for baptisms. The Quadragesimal fast closed with the cock-crow of resurrection morning, when began the festival of Easter. This was followed by the Quinquagesimal season ending with Pentecost.

There was a tendency to observe simply a Quadragesimal period to Ascension Day, but the Quinquagesima prevailed. An unbroken series of feast days followed for one week after Easter during which all business engagements and judicial processes were held in abeyance. The newly baptised were arrayed in their white baptismal garments (*dominus in albis*) until the octave of Easter, called White Sunday.

II. GERMAN.

BY PROFESSOR S. G. HEFELBOWER, A.M.

In the first two numbers (1905) of Luthardt's *Allgemeine Evangelisch-Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, there appeared an introductory article under the words: "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my word shall not pass away." The general tone of the article, as will be seen, is very gloomy; in fact we are convinced that it is too pessimistic; but it certainly represents the attitude of many conservative pastors and others. Therefore we reproduce it here.

Dare we use the words of Christ in speaking now concerning the Bible? One hundred years ago we could have used them, in spite of Rationalism, for that really did not attack the Word, it concerned itself only with its explanation. And even fifty years ago this text was applicable, although the criticism of that time had left us little more than the lids of the Bible. But the writers offered only bald assertions and suppositions. Proofs were required, and when they were not produced the genuineness of one after another of these books became established. Then came the great conflict. It had been proved that the sacred writers had lived and written as recorded, but, it was claimed, they had no more authority than many other great thinkers of the race; they were divinely sent messengers, it is true, but only in the sense in which Herodotus, Plato, Cicero and others were God's emissaries. "That which has hitherto passed with the Church as God's revelation proved to be only the product of Jewish theology and Grecian philosophy. The 'eternal' Word of God became the speculations of some Jews, which were probably useful and comprehensible for their times, but are without any claim for lasting authority." It was considered wrong to force the "conception of offering" for sin [vicarious atonement] upon the present generation. Even the picture of Christ as found in the gospels was conceived according to the taste of that time. He is reported to have spoken words that He never uttered, and to have performed miracles that never occurred, etc. Historical investigation has forever removed the mystic veil from the man

Jesus. The time for the old gospel is passed; a new view of things has broken upon the world, and with it a new religion.

If there were only a few individuals who held these views, they would merit little attention; but such opinions prevail with almost the entire cultured class, and certain professors of theology are the chief heralds of the "new religion." It has not been twenty years since the beginning of this attack on the gospel was made in the discussion concerning the Apostolicum and what an excitement that occasioned! But all was soon comparatively quiet, and now there are comparatively few who are aggressive in the conflict, there is no such thing as the Church rising in defense of God's Word.

And yet there is now special reason why the faithful believers in the integrity of the Bible should rush to the conflict. The advocates of the "new religion have begun the" publication of the "*Religionsgeschichtlichen Volksbuecher*" (Religious-historical annals for the people.) The title makes it plain that it knows and wishes to know nothing of revelation, or of the history of God given salvation, but accepts only a religious history of man, in which Christianity appears as one among many other religions; it is true, it is the best, but it simply developed in man. This journal is intended to reach the students in the Gymnasiums and Universities as well as the cultured laymen. And against this great anti-Bible, anti-Christ campaign the Church has failed to rise in her might. There are some strong apologists and many who accept the old faith, yet there is no general rushing to the conflict. But if the old zeal for the gospel were to stream through the Church, there would be war, victory-bringing war, and not long drawn out skirmishing.

Another sign of the times was mentioned: At a meeting of pastors [not a synod, but a convention of like minded liberal pastors] the question as to whether we dare now preach concerning the Son of God, was earnestly discussed. The "milder" party were of the opinion that the expressions "Son of God," "Divinity of Christ," "Saviour" and other like terms still had roots in certain congregations, and it would therefore be best to

bear with them awhile before casting them aside. The more extreme pastors held that that time had arrived, and that the doctrine concerning Christ was a stumbling block, and prevented the bringing of Christianity to the man of culture of today. One speaker even went so far as to advocate the substitution of the "religious reason" for revelation and objected to praying to Christ, and added: "The doctrine of God and of Christ should no longer be mixed. The latter belongs to the human side of the religious relation, *i. e.*, to the doctrine of man." And such men preach, or rather speak from evangelical Christian pulpits, and the appointed officials of the Church tolerate it. The speaker just quoted is a pastor in Berlin.

And this theology has triumphed in many places. It no longer approaches the Church in a bold struggle for its existence, it rather revels in the confidence of victory, and that in spite of superintendents and synods. There is no accepted standard, anarchy is everywhere. And the result of it all is a Christless people. And if Christ be taken away God cannot long remain. The religious prospect is dark. But this is not peculiar to Germany; Catholic France is in a still worse condition, and the other nations of the world are also suffering.

When the Middle Ages were giving place to the new intellectual movements of the Renaissance, many systems were turned up side-down, and there were those who awaited a new religion. But after the clouds had passed away it was found that only man's work had suffered change, and that God's Word did not pass away. And it will be the same in the storm and stress of the present troubled times. But the Church must rise in all her might to the conflict and arm herself with the unconquerable armor of God, and the fruits of the Spirit which will draw the whole world to her. But in place of these all-powerful fruits of the Spirit we so often see the manifest works of the flesh, pride, envy, strife. There must be more earnest healthful pietism in both pulpit and pew. The old theology must become a power, for the people want not words but spirit, not formulas but life.

But not everything is dark. The hopeful signs multiply, a

new and aggressive theology is quietly springing up which will surely soon make itself felt, and it is true: "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my word shall not pass away."

In number 8 of the *Christliche Welt* of this year Harnack discusses the "reliability of the gospel history," and finds the following difficulties in the way of accepting it as authoritative.

Immediately after the death of Jesus his followers conceived of him as throned in heaven and as possessing all the power of God. This was a great and abrupt change, for before this he had been a man among them. This new conception of him "outshone" their old knowledge, and made their recollection of his words and works hazy in a man made halo; accordingly we find many things in the gospel which do not belong there.

But how does Harnack *know* that this really was the condition of affairs? Do we not find here the very thing that he imagines he finds in the evangelists? a preconceived notion as to what Jesus really should be, which prevented him from seeing him as he really was?

The messianic elements in the apostles' conception of Jesus offer another difficulty. The Jews were expecting the Messiah of prophecy, who should manifest such and such distinguishing characteristics in personality and activity. Hence, Harnack concludes, "suddenly there appeared along with his real history a second and an unreal history, and there were added to their recollections of his person the characteristics of an imaginary Messiah who had never lived."

Again we ask, Whence does Harnack know all this? Were it not for the fact that he intends to be serious, we would be justified in considering his statements the absurdly impious poetizing of a godless man.

A third element that helps to make the gospel narrative unreliable was the religious syncretism of that age. Religions were wont to borrow many things from each other, and there was no reason why Jesus and his followers should not do the same. It is true, Harnack warns us against going to the ex-

tremes of the *Religionsgeschichtliche* school, but he finds "all sorts of unusual things," which cannot be accounted for in Judaism and the religious peculiarities of his person.

And Paul, the great apostle, simply constructed his own Christ, since he did not know Christ personally [just as Harnack is trying to do now.] "His conception of Christ stands before Christ whom he preached." Though Paulinism exerted but little influence on the writers of the gospels, which is greatly to their credit and proves their reliability, those who read the gospels now read them through glasses colored by Pauline theology. "His Christ was in many respects only his."

It is probable that this extreme position of Harnack will help rather than hinder the cause of positive theology, for, though it will serve to increase the devotion of some of his followers, it will tend to drive many earnest half negative men toward the camp of the conservatives.

The date and the circumstances of the writing of Luther's battle hymn seem to be as uncertain as ever. Prof. Tschackert, in the Oct. No. of *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, concludes that the hymn, which appeared for the first time in 1529, was in all probability written in 1528, when it seemed as if the evangelical cause was about to be crushed. Prof. Groessler, of Eisleben, published an article about the same time, in which he concludes that it was written during the closing hours of April 15th, 1521, but his proof is all found in tradition, which does not go back of 1570, which Troeltzsch rejects in a second article in *N. K. Z.*, and to this Groessler replied still adhering to his former position; and Troeltzsch again asserted his former conviction that 1528 was the year when it appeared, and rejects all of Groessler's authorities as unreliable, because they were too far removed from the time about which they reported.

During the last five years there has been considerable discussion among the leaders of the Church in Germany concerning

the use of individual communion cups. Late in 1904 the Imperial health board of Berlin delivered an opinion which we condense.

There are well authenticated instances of the communication of contagious diseases by using vessels or dishes which had been used by persons suffering from a contagious disease. However, up to the present time no such spreading of sickness by the communion cup has been recorded, yet we must admit that it is possible. But if we further consider in how many ways a person is exposed to contagion by coming into contact with objects that may be the carriers of disease germs, paper money, coin, books from a public library, etc., we must ask ourselves whether the spreading of contagion by the communion cup, which is certainly theoretically possible, really has such a practical meaning as is claimed on many sides.

The individual communion cups would of course be the surest means of protection, but these cannot be introduced in many of the poorer congregations. Generally speaking, sufficient protection can be had by using several cups successively which are cleansed by an attendant in a solution of soda before being used again. In fact the custom of turning after each administration and wiping the portion of the cup that comes in contact with the lips, is a sufficient precaution, especially if those who are suffering from suspicious diseases commune privately.

ARTICLE VIII.

REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK.

The Ethical Teaching of Jesus. By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., D. Litt., Professor of Theological Encyclopaedia and Symbolics in Union Theological Seminary, New York. 293 pp.

It is a good and hopeful sign of the times that so many books are being written and published with *The Teaching of Jesus*, as the chief term in their titles. It looks as though the cry of "Back to Christ," so prominently raised a few years ago, was bearing good fruit. Cer-

tainly every honest and devout effort to discover, or clearly to state, just what Jesus thought and taught on the great religious, moral and social questions, that are stirring men's minds and hearts, and moulding their lives today, is to be commended. And this seems to be the object of this latest book from the prolific pen of Dr. Briggs.

There are eighteen chapters bearing such titles as, "The Sources of the Teaching of Jesus," Chap. I.; "The Kingdom of God," Chap. V.; "Repentance and Faith," Chap. VI.; "Sin and Judgment," Chap. XIV.; "The Church and Society," Chap. XVIII., &c. In each chapter the author seeks to bring together, and to arrange in their logical order, the reported sayings of Jesus bearing on the topic of the chapter, and to determine their original form and exact meaning.

As might be expected from Dr. Briggs, the method followed is subjective rather than objective, and in many cases he changes the form of our Lord's words, as given in the gospels, or puts them into a different place or order, for no other reason, apparently, than because it seems to him more natural. Most of these changes do not materially affect the teaching of Jesus. Sometimes, however, they do so, as when, commenting on the parable of the Pharisee and the Publican, in the chapter on "Righteousness," p. 166, and especially on the closing words of the parable, "This man went down to his house justified rather than the other," Dr. Briggs says, "It is doubtful whether Jesus used that word justification, which may have come from the interpretation of St. Luke, the pupil of St. Paul," though he does add, "But Jesus used some word that was its real equivalent." Why not then, the word itself, just as reported by St. Luke, the only one who gives this parable? It is this science of juggling with the words of Scripture that must shake our faith either in the judgment of the critics, or in the reliability of the Scriptures themselves.

To read this book intelligently and with satisfaction, one should have at hand Dr. Briggs's other books, *New Light on the Life of Jesus* and *the Messiah of the Gospels*, to both of which frequent reference is made in the footnotes.

The publishers have done their work exceptionally well. The paper, the type, and the press work are all that is needed to make a beautiful and attractive volume.

JACOB A. CLUTZ.

A Harmony of the Gospels for Historical Study. By Wm. A. Stevens and Ernest D. Burton, third edition, revised. \$1.00.

A poor workman may complain of his tools, but a sensible craftsman avoids any ground of such complaint by securing the best possible. Students of the New Testament have been offered many arrangements of the Gospels, in the shape of fusions or harmonies. Of all that have come to our notice this is by far the best. The editors are themselves

earnest and careful students. They appreciate the value of an accurately arranged harmony such as will facilitate rapid study. One who uses this book will feel the spur of their own enthusiasm which quickens to effort. Here are no useless references to authorities which confuse the reader. The flexible binding which enables the book to lie open smoothly is itself an invitation to use it. The broad outlines of the gospel history are given in a principal division and in a full and clear analytical outline. Then follows an excellent index for finding any passage in the harmony, which is itself furnished with footnotes giving the readings of the margin of the English revised version and of the American revision. The passages from the different gospels are placed in paralld columns, so that comparisons can be made at a glance; indeed, this arrangement practically permits the student to dispense with a concordance for the gospels. Appendices contain suggestions to teachers, designed particularly for leaders of Bible classes; a very full list of repeated sayings of Christ so that the student may at once locate the passage in the proper historical setting; and a valuable list of Jewish history from 536 B. C. to 70 A. D. Perhaps the only addition to be desired in this connection is a list of books treating of this period, but any one at all familiar with the contemporary history will be able, from these references, to locate the events which fill the background of the gospel story.

Here then is a fine tool which any student, be of the scholastic or rabbinic temperament, or he of the prophetic and spiritual cast of mind, will find most useful in assisting him to a knowledge of the life and teachings of Christ. The wellknown scholarship of the editors makes it trustworthy. Inasmuch as this is the third edition revised, one may infer that there has been a demand which justifies its continued publication. It has been tried and found not wanting by the student body. These facts are in themselves sufficient recommendations. One need only try the book for himself to discover its worth.

D. W. WOODS, JR.

A. C. ARMSTRONG AND SON, NEW YORK.

Sermons Addressed to Individuals. By Reginald J. Campbell. 328 pp. \$1.25 net.

Books of sermons are as a general rule not very interesting literature for the majority of our readers. When sermons are put into print they seem to lose many of their original qualities, such as the occasion which gives rise to them; the circumstances under which they are delivered, and the personality and loving voice of the preacher. When these are absent there is indeed very little left beside the mere words and their peculiar arrangement in accordance with certain grammatical and rhetorical principles. Only he who understands these

principles can succeed in getting approximately near the thought they were meant to convey

But in spite of this the book of sermons here mentioned is among the exceptions to this general rule. Each sermon is prefaced by a brief account of the special circumstances which occasioned its preparation. In most cases they were the direct result of some personal interviews with persons who came to the pastor with their troubles and perplexities. Hence, the simple title of the book.

It is right here that a very commendable feature is found. Every sermon has an *aim* and that aim is very definite. The truth is not sown broadcast over the heads of the hearers, but is skillfully directed toward those for whom it was specially prepared, and the author gives us the hint that in nearly every case he accomplished his purpose. If nothing else were gained than just the simple way in which the author makes an application of this one homiletical feature the reader of this book would be amply rewarded.

It might be possible to find in some of the statements contained in this book such theological conceptions as might incur the wrath of some starched theologians, but since the sermons are given to us just as they were delivered—extempore speech—the reader who does not have an unduly critical eye will soon be lost in the deep spiritual and ethical tone as well as the intense sympathy which is greatly manifest in all these sermons. Above all the preacher never fails to emphasize the fact that the real remedy for all the doubts and fears of the human heart is the acceptance of Jesus Christ by a personal, active faith. On the whole I regard these sermons of considerable practical value, and they might be read by every minister of the Gospel with much profit.

E. C. RUBY.

LUTHERAN BOOK CONCERN, COLUMBUS, OHIO.

Luther's Marriage Ring. A selection of three sermons of Dr. Martin Luther on the marriage estate. From the German by Rev. J. Sheatsley, A.M., Delaware, Ohio. 1 p. 125.

As the basis of society is the home, and the basis of a happy home is marriage, properly entered into and sacredly observed and honored in all its relations, this little volume needs no apology for its publication.

The three sermons selected from Luther's writings give a clear presentation of his views on the holy estate of marriage. They are based respectively on text as follows: Heb. 13: 4; John 2: 1-11; Eph. 5: 22-33. There is added a Lutheran Marriage Service and a Marriage Hymn. Of the sermons the most striking characteristic is that the relations and duties of marriage are made "to reflect upon the reader's mind solely in the full light of God's word." The little volume is deserving of an extensive circulation.

R. H. CLARE.

A Flower's Mission, and other stories. Pp. 76.

This charming little book contains ten short stories for the little folks, of which the first is the story of *A Flower's Mission*. The stories are quite interesting, and will delight the little folks for whom they are intended. The book is printed on good paper, and altogether tastily gotten up.

R. H. CLARE.

BOARD OF PUBLICATION OF THE GENERAL COUNCIL.

Recent Sermons. By Joseph A. Seiss, D.D., LL.D., L.H.D., Pastor of the Church of the Holy Communion, Philadelphia, Pa. Pp. 325.

This volume of sermons was being prepared for publication by the author when his pen was stayed by his last sickness. The name of Dr. Seiss gives ample assurance that these sermons are of no ordinary grade. They present the same characteristics which mark his other sermons in volumes which have preceded this, and show that the author's intellectual strength was unabated by the advance of years, and that he maintained to the last his high standard of pulpit efficiency. The sermons in this volume are marked by a vigor of thought, and clearness and beauty of style, that make their perusal delightful and helpful. They are so simple that they can be read understandingly by the masses, while their penetrating exposition and scholarly finish will delight the educated. They bear the marks of a child-like faith and unfeigned piety, and display a keen insight unto the wants of our day and of our age.

As the last of Dr. Seiss' numerous productions these sermons, we think, will be especially cherished, and will be perused with feelings of sadness by many friends of the departed in all parts of our Church.

R. H. CLARE.

EATON AND MAINS, NEW YORK.

The Child as God's Child. By Rev. Charles W. Rishell, Ph.D.

The author characterizes his book as "a plea for the religious rights of the child." Initial and chief among these rights is the child's relation to God as it comes into this world. This relation must be correctly apprehended, and the child dealt with accordingly. In defining child nature the doctrine of original sin is accepted, while that of total depravity is denied. Infant character is a mixture of evil and good, the result of heredity. The good, as well as the evil, is the inheritance of every child, whether born of Christian parentage or not. "It may be improper, from the standpoint of technical theology, to speak of the child as regenerated; but it is not improper to say that it is the subject of divine gracious activity." In support of this view the almost universal belief that all children dying before the age of respon-

sibility are saved, not lost, and the recognition which Jesus gives to children as members of his kingdom, are cited. Upon this conception of the child's position the book is built.

The discussion opens with the question, whether a child can be religious, which is, of course, answered in the affirmative. In defining child piety, and particularly its appropriate manifestation, the author is very happy. "The boy evangelist may be sincere, and even effective, but he is a monstrosity." * * * * Encouragement should be given only to that kind of religious life which manifests itself in reverence, confidence, acquiescence in the providence of God, gratitude, love to God and man, and the like.

The task of Christian training is the "protection and development, from infancy to maturity, of the moral and religious state in which the babe enters the world. How this task may be most surely and effectively accomplished, this is the practical and difficult problem for which a solution is sought. The responsibility for this proper training belongs primarily to the parents. They are its chief agents, and after them pastors and teachers. The incomparable school for Christian nature is the home; the Sunday school and catechetical instruction are important supplementary agencies. Baptism admits the child into the Church, and the duty of the Church to care for the lambs of the flock is earnestly insisted upon. The concluding chapters on "The Critical Period," and "The Ideal," are both replete with valuable suggestions.

Concerning baptism the teaching presented in the Book of Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church is accepted. What the worth of this ordinance is, we do not recall. That it is anywhere denominated a sacrament, may be gathered from such statements as the following: "It is an outward sign of an inward grace," "a dedication to God," "a recognition of God's work already wrought in the soul, and that the child belongs to him," "baptismal regeneration is a fiction," "it confers nothing at the time, but it opens the way for future benefits of most blessed character." This kind of teaching completely empties Baptism of its divine content, and it need hardly be added that to a Lutheran and to many other Christians, it is wholly unsatisfactory. To him and to them Baptism is a sacrament, the bearer of grace.

With the qualification above indicated, the book is to be cordially received as a valuable contribution in the discussion of a very important subject. The views presented are the fruit of careful reflection, and the statement of them is clear and compact. The whole presentation is sensible and in admirable spirit.

L. KUHLMAN.

"*The Heart of Asbury's Journal.*" Edited by Ezra Squier Tipple, D.D. 8 vo. pp. 720. Price, cloth, \$1.50 net.

This is a volume of rare interest. It presents a vivid picture of the pioneer days of Methodism in America. Francis Asbury was a great

itinerant preacher, and he had a remarkable career. He came to America in 1771 and no one wielded a greater influence than he in the establishment and early development of the Methodist Episcopal Church. He was elected Bishop at the Christmas Conference in 1784, and for thirty years he traveled extensively, preaching the Gospel and superintending the work of the churches. His labors were not confined to the eastern states, but he rode in the saddle to the borders of Canada, and penetrated the western frontier to the Mississippi Valley. No records of American frontier adventure show greater courage or endurance than Asbury's travels beyond the mountains. Armed hunters, twenty-five or fifty in number, would escort him from point to point to protect him from the Indians, and wherever he appeared the meetings were marked by great spiritual awakenings. It has been said of him that he rivalled Melancthon and Luther in boldness; that he combined the enthusiasm of Xavier and the far-reaching foresight of Wesley. Moreover, he was a man of remarkable piety and devotion. Freeborn Garrettson said that Asbury prayed the most and prayed the best of all the men he knew.

In view of his extraordinary career, the Journal which Asbury kept during his many years of travel and observation has a special value. It gives such information of early Methodism as can be found nowhere else. Parts of the Journal were printed during Asbury's life time and were corrected by him, and the manuscript of the remainder revised under his direction and approved up to the year 1807. The author of this volume has put the Journal in more accurate and readable form by verifying whatever could be verified, by correcting evident errors, by omitting unimportant entries, by throwing light on many other statements, by explanatory notes, and by inserting numerous illustrations of individuals and places mentioned in the Journal, which add greatly to its interest. This book cannot fail to awaken new interest in the pioneer preacher and bishop, and the reader will lay down the volume with reluctance.

W. H. HARTMAN.

FOX, DUFFIELD AND CO., NEW YORK.

The Star of Bethlehem, a Miracle Play of the Nativity Reconstructed from the Towneley and other Old English Cycles of the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Centuries and Supplemented and Adapted to Modern Conditions, by Charles Mills Gayley, as Composed for Mr. Ben Greet, and Presented by his Company. (8x5 3-4; pp xx. 70 Price \$1.00.)

The doubt of many as to whether there is any propriety in the attempt to adapt the mediaeval mysteries to the modern stage will scarcely be removed by this composition. Those old dramatic performances have their interest and value to students of the drama, but for that purpose they are wanted in their original form, undiluted with modern admixture. Language that requires a glossary in footnotes is ill-suited for popular representation. The old conceptions will not fit into our twentieth century life, and such a reconstruction as the present can scarcely satisfy either scholarship or piety.

J. A. HIMES.

Herbert Spencer. An Estimate and Review. By Josiah Royce. Together with a Chapter of Personal Reminiscences by James Collier. Price \$1.25. Postage 10c.

In this small volume we have a very valuable contribution to right understanding, both of Herbert Spencer himself and of his philosophical teaching. Dr. Royce, if any man, fully comprehends that teaching, and having himself elaborated a type of evolutionary cosmology, is sufficiently sympathetic to do fair justice at least to Spencer's generic aim. This fair justice is everywhere evident in the kind tone marking the review and estimate.

From his introductory statement we learn that his impulse to write was at least measurably influenced by the recent appearance of Spencer's "Autobiography," through which both the philosopher and his works are seen in new perspective, enabling a better summing-up and characterization of what he has done for philosophic inquiry. The import and value of his work are now seen in nearer view and clearer light. Prof. Royce's plan is best given in his own statement in the introduction: "Spencer's life-work is a part of a very large historical movement." For the sake, therefore, of giving the whole discussion its due setting, I shall begin with a few comments upon the general history and meaning of the concept of Evolution. I shall then review what the Autobiography tells us about the origin and significance of Spencer's own view about Evolution. Thirdly, I shall attempt a sketch of this view itself in its finished form. Fourthly, I shall close with some critical observations upon the significance of Spencer's work as a thinker."

Accordingly, the reader finds briefly sketched how, from early times in various parts of the world, students of nature were led to interpret its phenomena under evolutionist conceptions.

A glance of these is given, and of the continuity of evolutionist thought in later philosophies down to modern times and the scientific theories of Lamarck and Darwin. But from the autobiographical disclosures we are informed that Spencer was extraordinarily innocent regarding every sort of nexus between his own philosophy and that of any remote period or foreign country. His processes were, for his consciousness, his own. Indeed we are made to see in him a surprising non-acquaintance with previous philosophical scholarship and a seemingly purposive self-isolation in working out the problems involved in his own thinking. One is impressed, indeed, with the great vigor and energy of his philosophic mind, but at the same time with his limited equipment of scholarly learning. Our author sketches for us the chief steps in his process in reaching and elaborating his famous scheme of "Synthetic philosophy," noting at the same time some gaps and difficulties.

In indicating his "estimate," Dr. Royce presents some distinct criticisms as to the soundness of Spencer's reasoning, showing how, at places, it fails to reach the point for which it is used. An instance of this is in

his analysis of the Spencerian principle of "unification of the purely phenomenal process of evolution." In this analysis he makes plain that Spencer's expositions fail to explain *how* the acknowledged "*opposing tendencies*" in nature are *unified*, as required in the process of evolution. "Just because every case of evolution is obviously a case where mutually opposing tendencies somehow balance one another, and combine into higher unities, the requirement for the situation is, not that the philosopher should tell us (truly enough) that evolution involves both shrinkings and swellings, both mixings and sortings, both variety and order, but that he should show us *how* these various tendencies are, in the various types of evolutionary process, kept in that peculiar balance and unity which, each time, constitutes an evolution. This is what Spencer has not done." "His theory of evolution does not determine the relations of the essential processes of evolution to one another, does not define their inner unity, and does not enable us to conceive a series of types of evolutionary processes in orderly relations to one another." This criticism cuts very deeply into the essence of Spencer's work.

The parts of the volume on Spencer's Educational Theories, and giving Collier's Personal Reminiscences, form very interesting reading, exhibiting, as they do, the famous philosopher in the environment and activities of his times.

Dr. Royce's small but attractive volume comes in good place. Such "a review and estimate" was due to the high prominence won by Spencer's great talent. His criticisms are due to truth. It may be that these criticisms may help to verify anew the now oft-asserted truth:

"Our little systems have their day ;
They have their day and cease to be."

M. VALENTINE.

LUTHERAN PUBLICATION SOCIETY, PHILADELPHIA.

The Atonement and Modern Thought By Junius B. Remensnyder, D. D., LL.D., Author of "Heavenward," "Doom Eternal," "Six Days of Creation," "Lutheran Manual," etc., etc. With *An Introduction* by Prof. Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary. 75 cts till July. afterward \$1.50.

We welcome this volume as a timely and valuable contribution to our current theological and devotional literature. We have read it with great interest and satisfaction. Of course, upon this high and long discussed theme, with its transcendent realities and bearings, there will inevitably be found some forms of definition and representation not preferred by all Christians; but the volume sets forth and vindicates the essential elements and features of the atonement as accepted in the faith of all the orthodox denominations of the Church. In its substance and meaning, it is the atonement of the Church Confessions. It is strongly presented, and defended with ability and logical force.

In the XXXIX brief chapters of the work the great truth is viewed in all the chief aspects and relations it sustains to Christianity as a whole and as organically connected with the various constituent truths of the order of salvation. Some of the closing chapters are most impressive and inspiring presentations of the central and vital character of this great doctrine and of the supreme necessity of its firm maintenance, as the truth of all gospel truths for saving faith and redemptive power.

Dr. Warfield has written a cordial and instructive introduction, especially calling attention to the false tendencies in the so-called "liberal" thought of our day, which make the appearance of this volume timely. There is great need for it, and it ought to have a wide reading.

M. VALENTINE.

LUTHERANS IN ALL LANDS CO.

Luther's Church Postil Gospels, First to Twelfth Sunday after Trinity. Translated by Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. 1 p. 39, \$2 25.

The Epistles of St. Peter and St. Jude, preached and explained by Martin Luther. Translated and edited by Prof. John Nicholas Lenker, D.D. Pp. 383, \$2.25.

We take pleasure in again commending Dr. Lenker's efforts to give us Luther in English. The old gospel has lost none of its power as interpreted long ago by the prince of preachers. The devout Spenser said, "Among all his writings his *Church Postil* is one of the very best, as he himself called it, his most beloved book, in which he sets forth the divine truth with a rich spirit; and the less he shows of art and eloquence, found in his other books, the more power the devout reader receives from it." These sermons on the Church year will edify the lay reader, and be of special value to the preacher.

The commentary on the Epistles of Peter and Jude is characterized by Luther's keen insight into Scripture and his simplicity of expression. While the work has little critical value, it has freshness and force and is capable of rendering useful service after nearly four centuries of existence.

J. A. SINGMASTER.

ATLANTIC MONTHLY, BOSTON, MASS.

The April number of the *Atlantic* opens with a strong and timely paper on "The Cost of War." It is followed by one on "The Eternal Life," which will be widely read. This number contains articles on "A Bay Window in Florida;" "In the District Attorney's Office;" "Henry James;" "Christian Thomasius;" "Letters of Mark;" "Significant Books on Politics and Economics;" "The Right and Wrong of the Monroe Doctrine" and the fourth installment of "Thoreau's Journal." Two interesting chapters of "The Coming of the Tide;" "The White Llama;" "Stranger than Fiction;" and "The Recompense;" make up the fiction of this number. The poems and the "Contributors Club" are fine. Indeed this number is only another proof of the fact that there is no magazine which so consistently maintains its standard of excellence as the *Atlantic* does.

HOUGHTON, MIFFLIN AND COMPANY, BOSTON AND NEW YORK.

The Dynamic of Christianity A Study of the Vital and Permanent Element in the Christian Religion. By Edward Mortimer Chapman.

Here is a capital book. But to be properly appreciated and to be made profitable it must be read with care and with some discrimination. The author does not follow the beaten track of theological discussion, neither does he blaze out a pathway entirely new. He seems rather to translate the scholastic terms of theology into terms of living experience. He is not so much concerned about the relations of the persons of the Trinity to each other, as about the relation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit to us.

The author's scientific standpoint is that of Evolution—not the Evolution of the atheist, or of the agnostic, but Evolution by a personal, omnipotent, immanent God, who is present in every place and with every creature, and works according to a plan which the mind of man can perceive and apprehend. He insists that this thought must be applied to Christianity and to the history of the Church. "Sin is the permission of disorder in the life of the spiritual man." "Regeneration is a real episode in human life—a fundamental episode in Christian life." "Salvation is not so much a salvation *from* a fate, as *to* an opportunity. Yet the one implies the other, and the old-time preaching of hell was in no sense irrational or needless; though it was too often ill-proportioned." The author finds the real Dynamic of Christianity in Christ's doctrine of the Spirit. The Holy Spirit is immanent and personal. He is ever making new applications of the great fundamental principles of the Gospel. He gives men the experience of salvation. He speaks directly to their souls. Under his guidance nothing is to be feared from Science, Philosophy or Criticism.

The book is most cleverly written. It stimulates thought. It speaks to the heart. It strengthens faith. The author is up to date in his acquaintance with theological literature, but is entirely independent in his thinking. We regret that he did not give more prominence to the divine Word as the instrument of the Spirit's activity.

J. W. RICHARD.

A. C. ARMSTRONG & SON, NEW YORK.

The Epistles to the Colossians and Thessalonians. By Joseph Parker, D.D. Crown octavo. Cloth bound. 303 pages. Price \$1.25.

The Practical and Devotional Commentary is an undertaking similar in plan and scope to *The Expositor's Bible*, and is issued under the supervision of the editor of the work, Dr. W. Robertson Nicoll. This the first volume to appear, is Dr. Parker's last work and bears the impress of that master mind among expository preachers.

Each epistle is freely rendered, after the style of the annotated text of the People's Bible. But the objection made by some to that work,

that the author beats out his material too thin, cannot be sustained here. The gist of each verse is at once perceived and set forth in clear, terse statements. The exposition is more sermonic than critical; more devotional than didactic. The author availed himself of the results of modern scholarship, but produced a thoroughly conservative book. Philemon is also included, but treated as a whole instead of by verse. Should the others of the series be equal to the standard set by this volume, a worthy addition will be made to the literature of the commentator.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.

AMERICAN TRACT SOCIETY, NEW YORK.

The Teaching of Jesus Concerning God the Father. By Archibald Thomas Robertson, D D. Cloth bound. 182 pages. Price 75 cents.

This is the third of a series on the "Teachings of Jesus." In it the author sets forth with masterly use of exegetical power the New Testament conception of God. It is a pleasure to find a work so thoroughly Scriptural and evangelical. Beginning with the basic ideas which Jesus must have had from the Old Testament, and advancing to the full knowledge of his relation to the Father, the words of Jesus are found to be the true norm of revealed theology. "Christ is not man's effort to find God, but God's endeavor to reveal himself to men." The relation of God to the world, to believers, and to the unsaved, is clearly and fully stated; and it is shown that the Apostles continued in these same doctrines, as revealed by Jesus. The book is profitable for reading and study, being theology without the heaviness of theological statement.

STANLEY BILLHEIMER.